

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—JULY, 1886.—No. 43.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ANATOMICAL ANOMALIES.

Les Anomalies Musculaires chez l'Homme expliquées par l'Anatomie Comparée-leur importance en Anthropologie. Par le Docteur L. Testut. Preface par M. le Prof. Duval. Paris, 1884. G. Masson.

I.

IT is a well-recognized fact that very frequently deviations from the usual structure are found in the human body. This is true of all the systems, of the bones, ligaments, muscles, blood-vessels, nerves, and of the internal organs. Sometimes the peculiarity is simply an increase or diminution in size of some particular muscle, artery, or bony prominence. Sometimes an artery or a nerve supplies by its branches a somewhat larger or smaller expanse than usual. Sometimes two neighboring muscles are more or less fused together, or the split that partially divides a muscle may be uncommonly deep. It is needless to say that, though the knowledge of these variations may sometimes be of great value to the surgeon, and that therefore they should be carefully studied, still they are of little scientific interest. But there are other variations of which this cannot be said, which, on the contrary, are of great importance on account of the bearing their interpretation may have on the great questions of the day. These are such as occasionally reproduce in the body of man forms of structure that are normal in the bodies of lower animals. It must not be sup-

posed that the peculiarities referred to are of the nature of monstrosities or the result of morbid processes. For the most part they are not recognized during life, and have little or no influence for better or worse on the health of the individual. Before considering them in detail, let us glance at a few points in the structure and development of the bodies of man and of other vertebrate animals.

It is evident that they are built on the same general plan. They have a backbone, a spinal cord above it (in the upright position behind it) which enlarges in front (or above) into a brain. On the other side of the vertebral column are the digestive tract, the respiratory and circulatory systems. The extremities in all the higher animals are evidently modifications of the same type. Great as are the bodily differences between man and the nearest animals, they are differences of degree and not of kind.

When we examine the early embryonic stages of man and other mammals, the resemblance is increased. This is not in itself surprising, as it is but natural that the outlines of structure should appear first, and specific differences later; but what is very remarkable is that the embryos of higher animals present as transitory features structures that are permanent in lower ones. On the strength of this it has been asserted that the individual embryo rapidly runs through the changes that its ancestors have undergone in their progress up the zoölogical ladder. It is clear that this is assuming much more than we know. Not only does it beg the question of descent, but it is far from the demonstrated fact that it is passed off for. But however much the facts have been misinterpreted and the claims exaggerated, there remains something. We may at least say that the human embryo has certain transient features that are permanent in some lower animals.

In early stages of the vertebrate embryo the arteries make a series of arches in the neck closely resembling the permanent disposition of the main trunks in the gills of fishes. The minute openings which we sometimes see in the neck or about the ear of grown persons are explained as remnants of branchial clefts which once existed between these arteries. Of the five arterial arches on either side of the middle line, not necessarily existing at once, some remain pervious and some close up and disappear. Those that remain form the great vessels of the top of the chest and of the neck. Now in different classes of vertebrate animals, though the ground-plan is the same, the permanent arrangement is not. Thus in reptiles certain vessels remaining open form a double arch of the aorta, the great vessel that carries the blood from the heart; but in birds the vessel of one side is obliterated at an early period, so that there is but a single arch of the aorta which loops over the

right division of the windpipe. In mammals the vessel of the right side disappears and the aorta crosses the left air-tube.

Let us cite a few other examples relating to particular parts. The kidney in the human embryo is lobulated as in many animals, though it is smooth in the adult. Some muscles and tendons in the extremities have ape-like proportions. A certain fissure in the brain (*the external parieto-occipital*), which is well marked in apes, appears early in the human being and soon dwindles almost to nothing. Darwin laid much stress on the curious fact that the immature whalebone whale has teeth which never cut the gum and ultimately disappear.

These transitory stages being over and the animal having reached its adult state, there are found a number of so-called rudimentary organs, neither useful nor ornamental, which represent structures that have their uses in other species. These constitute a class of phenomena nearly allied to the anomalies that form the subject of this paper, but differing from them by being constant instead of only exceptionally present. The resemblance is the greater because these useless rudimentary organs are particularly prone to vary. A familiar example are the little ear muscles by which the shape of the outer ear may be changed in certain animals, but which in man are quite inert. Another instance is a thin layer of muscular fibres under the skin of the neck which represents a layer extending over most of the body by which many animals can wrinkle their skins so as to shake off insects or water. There is reason to believe that several other parts of the human body should be classed as rudimentary organs.

Let us now consider the body from another point of view. We have said that the bodies of vertebrate animals are built on a common plan, and the word "plan" was used advisedly. There is beyond question a certain symmetry and correspondence of parts in animals which is somewhat analagous to crystallization in inorganic matter. In vertebrates there is lateral symmetry or resemblance between the two sides, a serial homology between different segments of the body and between the extremities. Thus the shoulder and the hip, the arm and the thigh, the elbow and knee, the forearm and leg, the wrist and ankle, the hand and foot, evidently correspond in some way to one another. The precise nature of the correspondence between the limbs is a disputed point. Most authorities hold that the hind limbs are serial repetitions of the fore ones; others, that the front half of the body is to be compared to the hind half as the right is to the left, in which case it must be assumed that the homologue of the head remains rudimentary or is suppressed. A vast amount has been written on the subject. Attempts have been made to show homologies between

particular bones, muscles, arteries, and nerves according to various systems, and not a little confusion has resulted. In work of this kind the imagination must be kept well in hand. One considers with astonishment what utter trash has been written by really able men, bringing undeserved discredit on this field of research. The truth has been hidden by exaggerations. Because transcendental anatomists wrote nonsense, many have over hastily assumed that the underlying idea is a delusion. The trouble has been that the transcendentalists attempted too much. The data were wanting for even much more general comparisons than they instituted. No unbiassed mind, however, can fail to recognize symmetry in the individual and homology in different species. The arm is very different in man, the tiger, the horse, the bat, the seal, the eagle, the penguin, and the turtle; but in each of these there is an evident correspondence of parts with those in others and also with those in the hind limb of the same animal.

II.

Let us now pass in review some of the anomalies that are occasionally found in man. Very rarely a knob is seen projecting downward from the under surface of the base of the skull near the spine. Most books on human anatomy say nothing of it, and the student who knows nothing of comparative anatomy would be quite at a loss to account for it; but it represents a structure found in many mammals. It is greatly developed in several of the ungulata, as the sheep, the horse, the rhinoceros, etc. Again we occasionally meet with a hook-like bony excrescence from the humerus, a little above the inner side of the elbow, from which a fibrous band makes a bridge over an opening which corresponds to a hole in the bone in some apes, in some carnivora, and in some species of other orders through which an important nerve and artery pass. It is generally taught that this arrangement serves to protect these structures from pressure during the long continued contraction of some of the muscles. Be that as it may, if it is of any use in man, which may be doubted, the favored possessors of this structure are few and far between. Some authorities state that it occurs about three times in a hundred, but the writer's experience leads him to believe that it is much rarer. Remarkable anomalies are found in the large bloodvessels (those in the small are too numerous to discuss) depending on the irregular persistence or closure of the branchial arteries already mentioned. Sometimes the aorta arches over the right bronchus, as in birds, sometimes there is a double arch, as in reptiles.

Anomalies of the muscular system are very numerous and in-

teresting, but one or two instances will suffice. In man there are two deep muscles in the front of the forearm, of which one is the long flexor of the thumb, the other the deep flexor of the fingers. In apes, the thumb being comparatively unimportant, its long flexor is either wanting or more or less fused with that of the fingers. Now it is extremely common to find in man the long flexor of the thumb connected by a fleshy mass with either the deep or the superficial flexor of the fingers. The degree of fusion varies, and is found to correspond now to the condition in one ape, now to that in another. Just how far this correspondence may be purely accidental cannot be determined. Let us pass from the hand to the foot where there is a more striking instance. In apes the great toe has very free motion and is functionally much of a thumb, having a long abductor muscle pulling the toe away from the foot, which in man is quite wanting. Nothing could be more natural, one at first exclaims; but why is it that this muscle appears occasionally in man without any corresponding change in the articulations of the foot to permit increased motion? The anomalies of the muscular system are not merely such as have their analogies in animals near to man; they embrace an immense range. The arrangement represented may belong to members of very distant and aberrant mammalian orders, and even to birds, reptiles and amphibians.

Owing to the large number of human bodies dissected every year, we are more familiar with the anomalies of man than with those of the lower animals, but there is no doubt that similar variations occur in the latter. In studying the meaning of these phenomena it is clear that we must look for an explanation that will apply to all cases.

The appearances in question have always furnished one of the favorite arguments of evolutionists. How, they ask, can these things be accounted for on the theory of special creation? What possible explanation of them can be given if man and the animals each appeared in their present condition? Darwin wrote of rudimentary organs, and doubtless meant to apply the same reasoning to anomalies, that to understand them "we have only to suppose that a former progenitor possessed the parts in question in a perfect state, and that under changed habits of life they became greatly reduced. Thus we can understand how it has come to pass that man and all other vertebrate animals have been constructed on the same general model, why they pass through the same early stages of development, and why they contain certain rudiments in common. Consequently we ought frankly to admit their community of descent; to take any other view is to admit that our own structure, and that of all the animals around us, is a mere snare laid to entrap

our judgment.”¹ In an earlier work he wrote: “Rudimentary organs may be compared with the letters of a word, still retained in the spelling but become useless in the pronunciation, but which serve as a clue to its derivation. On the view of descent with modification we may conclude that the existence of organs in a rudimentary, imperfect, and useless condition, or quite aborted, far from presenting a strange difficulty, as they assuredly do on the ordinary doctrine of creation, might even have been anticipated in accordance with the view here explained.”²

That they present great difficulties, according to crude notions of special creation, must be conceded; but let us first see whether evolution offers as simple and satisfactory an explanation as these quotations would imply. Dr. Testut's book, the title of which is at the head of this article, is a very valuable addition to anatomical literature. The author discusses the anomalies of muscles with great care, giving the references to the original articles. The account of each anomaly is followed by a list of the animals in which the arrangement in question is the normal one. The book is marred, however, by unphilosophical reasoning. It is but fair to mention that Professor Duval, who wrote the preface, seems in this respect a more pronounced offender than the author. The preface is, indeed, so admirable an example of pseudo-science that a short extract may be allowed:

“The doctrine of transformism, so wonderfully started by Lamarck, so perfectly established by Darwin, has shown that individual variation may be divided into two orders of facts which are absolutely distinct as to significance and origin, but have in common the laws of heredity which they obey, and those of transformism of species of which they are the manifestations. In short, of these two orders of variations the one is in a manner a step towards the future, that is, towards transformations yet to come, the other a return to the past, that is, towards changes already accomplished. The former are progressive anomalies, the latter retrogressive ones.”

Who would not suppose from the absolute complacency with which this is laid down that these statements rested on fact instead of on theories? The pity is the greater because the book, as was said before, is an excellent one so long as the author keeps to facts and avoids theories. One is inclined to exclaim with Father Harper: “Why cannot we have the simple facts of experience and observation, without being persecuted at every turn with a *view*?”

Who can tell how much harm such books do, not to the Catholic student who is true to himself, but to the graduates of Protestant colleges? It is not to be expected that they should sus-

¹ The Descent of Man, Chap. 7.

² The Origin of Species, Chap. 13.

pect learned men of writing arrant nonsense, of giving as truth what is but conjecture, of declaring proved what is obviously mere assertion. Such young men deserve great sympathy. If they take chaff for wheat it is often because they know no better. The lies of centuries have given them a false idea of the Catholic Church. They have brains enough to see that Protestantism is a failure. What is left them? How can they, humanly speaking, escape being deceived by a false philosophy? There are signs in plenty that many would gladly accept better things if they had them.

Returning from this digression, to give an example of the subject itself as well as of Dr. Testut's method of treating it, let us briefly review his "explanation" of the anomalies of the biceps. This muscle runs between the shoulder-blade and the fore-arm. It arises by two heads, whence its name, one called the long head springing from the glenoid cavity of the shoulder-blade and running through the shoulder-joint, the other arising from the so-called coracoid process of the same bone. They soon unite to form an elongated muscle which occupies the front of the arm ending just below the elbow. Its tendon is inserted into the outer bone of the fore-arm, but it joins the fibrous covering of the muscles below the elbow. It should be noticed that the muscle runs from the shoulder-blade to the fore-arm, having no connection with the upper arm. It is a good example, being a comparatively simple muscle, one very wide-spread among vertebrates and one very subject to variations in man. We shall follow our author through at least several of these. 1st. The cleft usually confined to the beginning of the muscle is complete, cutting it into two lying side by side. This is explained as perfectly natural, because in many animals each part is a complete muscle and either may exist alone, though in primates they are fused together. Both of them are present in the crocodile. 2d. The glenoid half is wanting. We are told that this is normal in the rhinoceros, the pig, the ostrich, the frog, and other animals. But what has this to do with man? No one ever claimed that he descended from either of these animals. 3d. The coracoid portion is wanting. This is said to be merely a reproduction of the type of many species of several orders, as the paca, the hedgehog, the beaver, two species of monkeys, many carnivora, as the hyena, the dog, the cat, the seal, the bear (not always), and others. Dr. Testut, however, omits to mention that, common as this arrangement is among animals, it is very rare in man. 4th. There is an extra head from the coracoid. Our author is struck by the resemblance to the *ornithorhynchus*, and alludes to more or less marked tendencies towards reduplication of the muscle in some saurians, chameleons, and birds. 5th. By far the most common anomaly in

man is the occurrence of one or more extra heads from the bone of the upper arm or from neighboring muscles, but this is by no means common in animals. It is found in the rhinoceros, in some bats, occasionally in the ourang, and in some other cases. It would be too great a trial of the reader's patience to go through all the variations of this muscle. Neither is it necessary, for we have already seen that in man it occasionally resembles a vast number of the most diverse animals. Were we to continue we should have to add to the list the chimpanzee, the dromedary, the giant kangaroo, and turtles; and all this from the study of a single muscle. There is, however, one more set of variations in this muscle that deserves mention from its bearing on the theory of the repetition in the embryo of alleged ancestral peculiarities. In some animals, the horse, for instance, the long head of the biceps does not run through the shoulder-joint, but along the outside of its capsule, projecting into the joint, but not running through its cavity like a detached cord, as in man. It has been shown that in the early stages of the shoulder-joint in man, and in animals having the same arrangement, the tendon is at first attached to the capsule and gradually frees itself to gain its position in the joint. This is quoted as a transitory appearance of a lower type, but it is probable that the resemblance is purely accidental. It is not easy to see how the tendon could be developed in the middle of the joint. It is, if not necessary, at least much more natural that it should separate itself from the capsule. Pursuing this train of thought, we find that there is often great difficulty in deciding whether a given anomaly is really a representation of an animal structure or not. Happily it is not necessary to decide in every case; for, though there may be many on debatable ground, there are many also that are clearly of one class or the other.

How are these facts to be accounted for? Is it true that heredity is the necessary explanation? It appears so at first sight, but with a little study the supposed necessity fades away. All are familiar with instances of the inheritance of some defect or peculiarity, usually the reverse of desirable, which reappears in families often after the lapse of one or two generations. How natural it seems to account for anomalies in the same way. If, indeed, these anomalies were always, as they sometimes are, in the line of supposed descent of the body, their significance as an argument in its favor would be very great; but it is lost by the irregularity of their appearance. It has been shown above how one anomaly is traced to the camel, another to the rhinoceros, another to the bat, another to birds, and some even to turtles and amphibians. As the distinguished Professor Gegenbauer has intimated in a review of Testut's book, it is hardly satisfactory, in view of these facts, to read on the title page:

"Anomalies Musculaires *expliquées* par l'Anatomie comparée." The explanation needs explaining. No one maintains that man descends from a turtle or a bird or a camel, but at most that there is some cousinship, say a few millions times removed. Surely if man's body were derived from some lower animal, either we should expect to find the hereditary characteristics, both the constant and the occasional, pointing so clearly in a given direction as to be unmistakable; or else we should have to hold that they have no bearing on the question. Further, if structures appearing in widely separated classes are inherited from a common ancestor, either he must have been a very polyglot having the most diverse and highly specialized organs fully developed, which is absurd, or he must have had them potentially, of which there is no evidence. A great difficulty which the followers of Darwin's theory pure and simple, which is not to be confounded with evolution as a whole, have had to contend with, is the appearance of similar organs in such widely separated parts of the animal kingdom that it is impossible to account for them by gradual modifications. Professor Mivart¹ points out that "the conception of an innate force similarly directed in each case, and assisted by favorable external conditions," removes the difficulty. But if the difficulty is insuperable, according to the original theory, in the case of constant structure, how much more so in that of those of rare occurrence. The attempt to explain these things by heredity is a failure.

III.

Still there must be an explanation both of the occurrence of variation and of its reproducing peculiarities of other and often distant species. Let us take the latter part of the question first. Probably the cause is to be sought in symmetry, in homology, in short, in the archetype. We now enter a higher sphere than that of physical observation. There is a general plan of a vertebrate animal implying a certain symmetry and certain main features, but susceptible of modification in detail. Where is this archetypal idea? It cannot be in the mind of the observer, for it is an objective or ontological, not a logical idea. It cannot be in the animals themselves, for, apart from the pantheism in such a suggestion, the idea is antecedent to its expression. It can be only in God. Evidently, then, it is beyond our grasp, but of its existence we can be certain. To those educated in agnostic schools such a doctrine sounds unscientific. Dr. Conn² in his recent summary of evolution

¹ The Genesis of Species.

² Evolution of To-day, by H. W. Conn, Ph.D., Instructor of Biology at Wesleyan University. New York & London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886. This is a popular statement of the various theories and in many respects a very creditable work. The

speaks of the theory of types "as not open to investigation since it lies beyond the realm of human knowledge," and again he alludes to it as a supernatural rather than a natural explanation. Knowing as we do that the existence of God is within the scope of human reason, we need no extended argument to prove that in the great act of creation He is not without a purpose. He has certain ideas in the sense expounded by St. Thomas.¹ Nothing more is needed to establish the doctrine of types. Dr. Conn finds a difficulty in our ignorance of the number of types and in the fact that what he takes to be types apparently run into one another. Here the difficulty truly enough is in the inadequacy of human reason, which from its very nature cannot know all that is in the Divine Mind; but we can know the grand fact without knowing the details. For example, we know that God created heaven and earth but we do not know to what extent He made use of what we call evolution, and our ignorance of this in no way impairs our knowledge of the fact of creation. Dr. Conn recognizes the possibility of a combination of the theory of types with evolution, but he seems to be haunted by a fear from which he cannot escape that a so-called supernatural explanation is not "scientific."

Although, as has been said, the archetypal idea is in God, its effect is in the creatures themselves, much as the law of attraction is in matter. It determines the action of their substantial forms. All vertebrate species having a common plan, it is not in the least more wonderful that a variation should occur through homology than through heredity. Nay, if the variation be one that by the latter theory could come only from an ancestor who existed, if at all, ages ago, the former is infinitely more probable. To explain a bird-like peculiarity in man by heredity is absurd, by homology is not. True, we cannot tell by what mechanism it acts, neither can we tell how heredity acts in those cases in which its influence is undoubted. If to defend a theory it were necessary to demonstrate the details of its *modus operandi*, what would become of physical science?

The doctrine of types is particularly offensive to ultra-evolutionists, because it necessitates the recognition both of a Creator and of a God-given tendency in the created. It contradicts flatly the teaching, so dear to certain minds, that organized beings with man at their head started from low beginnings and, without definite tendency, somehow blundered into their present perfection.

We have now to meet the question whether the occurrence of anomalies is consistent with the view of the immediate creation of

author evidently endeavors to be fair and shows no signs of anti-religious bias, but he is influenced and his intelligence hampered by agnostic ideas.

¹ Summa, Pl. Quæst. XV., Art. 2.

man's body, and of the stability of species. Showing, as these phenomena do, an undoubted tendency to variation, at first it seems that there is a contradiction, but it is very doubtful whether they can be quoted on either side. It is no new observation that nature presents a series of gradations ; it is no new statement that man is an animal distinguished from other animals only by his soul. True, the soul, his substantial form, removes him, as Professor Mivart has remarked, further from the nearest brute than that brute is from a stone ; none the less his body has the structure of an animal and the lower part of his nature is animal. Why, then, should not man's body, as well as other animals' bodies, be liable to vary ? Why it should vary can be only guessed at, probably it is in consequence of an imperfection of animal (and vegetable) nature. But, be that as it may, the point of our contention is, that the assumption that anomalies of structure give evidence of descent, is entirely unjustified ; and that if every animal had been created precisely as it is, still their common nature might, under certain (quite unknown) conditions, permit variations within certain limits defined by the laws of symmetry and homology. We have no desire to discuss the origin of man's body, and would not be understood to be arguing against the possibility of its derivation from an animal, which, it seems to us, may, in the want of a decision from Rome, be held as an hypothesis, provided always that reasonable probability should be discovered in its favor.

EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA IN FRENCH COLONIAL DAYS.

I.

LAST winter the Louisiana Education Society asked for original essays on educational matters, wishing to obtain "the most practical thought and careful thinking in this line."

The desire to receive practical information on this vitally important subject is a hopeful sign. For as soon as people say there is no more for them to learn, progress is at an end; or should any avenues of progress remain open to them, it will be of that species which a humorous native of a certain island, not unknown in song and story, graphically described as "progress to the rear."

Ignorance has been called the foundation of knowledge. An ignorant man has one advantage over an ill-educated man: he has nothing to unlearn. In a similar sense repentance may be the foundation of virtue; there is hope for the evil-doer who admits he has done wrong; while little good is expected of one who argues himself into the belief that wrong is right, and that there is nothing in him susceptible of improvement.

A philosopher of the Middle Ages reproached a conceited brother of the same craft with being unable to say "*nescio*." The reproach of St. Bernard to Abelard can scarcely be made to the above body, for if its members had seen no room for improvement in the methods employed with their sanction, they would not have sought to obtain "more practical thought in this line."

But none of our contemporary educators appear to have sought any light on early education in Louisiana. Perhaps they deem history a blank as to its educational aspect in Colonial and early American times. The itinerant lecturer, like the schoolmaster, has been "abroad" during the pleasant winters of Louisiana, and the business of this functionary seems to be to tell the rising generation that, despite the statemanship, military renown, and philanthropy of the past, the light that was in these regions was darkness. Why? Because there were no godless schools. The South was slow to introduce a system which came when Colonial days were over, and which experience has proved to be subversive of religion and morality, as indeed its originators intended it should be. (See Brownson's "Convert," chapters 7 and 8.)

We will endeavor to show some deeds of our predecessors "in this line," which perhaps may awaken in a few a desire to know more

of what was undertaken in the distant past, in the face of tremendous obstacles, that in this respect a tardy justice may be done to the "brave days of old." And some who imagine that nothing which *they* cannot remember was ever done for popular education in this State, may be glad to have brought under their notice the earliest efforts made to educate the youth of "*Notre Chère Louisiane*."

To elucidate this theme thoroughly, it would be well to give a synopsis of the history of Louisiana, the dynasties that took, but would not keep, for their crowns so fair a jewel, the men of renown who sojourned within her borders, the feats of arms done in her defence by loyal citizens and reclaimed privateers, the Indian wars raging almost without truce, the foreign and civil wars, the stock-jobbing of Law, who was to create wealth, so to say, by the wand of a magician. These remarkable men, and deeds of valor, and banking bubbles, had their influence on education, and it would be a pleasing task to trace it in its various phases through administrative, municipal, religious, and domestic life. But all this will appear sufficiently for our purpose in the tenor of these pages.

II.

La Salle reached the Mississippi on April 6th, 1682. On the 9th, he baptized the country which he had explored by the sweet-sounding name *Louisiana*, and his chaplain, in presence of twenty-three French, eighteen Abnaki, ten Indian women, and three children, blessed *Louisiana* and dedicated it to God amid the roaring of cannon, the singing of hymns, and the recital of appropriate prayers. Five years later, La Salle was assassinated. Nothing was done to colonize the immense territory of which he had been viceroy. His grand discovery was almost forgotten, and the Father of Waters disappeared from the navigators' charts. When another famous mariner, Iberville, entered the great river by the gulf, March 2d, 1699, not a hut was to be seen. Sea-marsh and virgin forests greeted his eyes; but, as time wore on, mementos of the earlier sailors appeared. A letter, or *speaking bark*, from Tonti, and a breviary in which was written the name of a companion of La Salle, were given to Iberville by an Indian, and Tonti himself came, like a ghost from the past, to tell the mighty deeds of his brave but unfortunate master to the mariners now following up his discoveries.

Chevalier Tonti, La Salle's trusted friend, was known as "the Man of the Copper Hand." The loss of a hand in the wars in Sicily he had repaired by one made of copper.

The premature death of Sauvolle in Biloxi, and of Iberville in the West Indies, left the sole care of Louisiana to their brother Bienville, who became the founder of New Orleans and Mobile.

When Bienville, with unerring sagacity, selected on a bend of the great river the best site for a commercial emporium, he set fifty men (1718) to clear the soil of its rank vegetation and build huts of moss and wattles, roofed with bark and palmetto. In 1722, just as the capital had been transferred to *Nouvelle-Orleans* from the lonely beach of Biloxi, there were one hundred cabins scattered over the highest patches of the morass, and Charlevoix, who visited the embryo city, was touched by the spiritual destitution of the white settlers and the Indians whose camp-fires lit up the river-banks and sparkled in the dense forests beyond the flimsy palisade. There was no need of schools. Few children, if any, had come to bless the dismal kraal in which the keen-eyed Charlevoix saw the nucleus of a populous and opulent city. In 1723 the Bishop of Quebec sent Franciscans to the white settlers, and in 1724 Jesuits came to evangelize the Indians. By 1726 many women had joined their husbands, and children were frolicking in the jungle and staring with terror in their wide eyes at the alligators that wriggled in the moat and the frogs that croaked forever in the slime. At that early date the sagacious Bienville was devising ways and means to furnish the Colony with good schools. He was too acute not to perceive that families would not establish permanent homes in the Colony unless educational facilities were provided for their children. A boys' school arose at once beside the warehouse that did duty for a church, and the first teacher that ever instructed the youth of Louisiana was Father Cecil, a Capuchin monk.

So far as I can learn, no picture or memorial of this pioneer of literary and scientific education exists in any college of Louisiana. In the university endowed by Mr. Tulane I saw pictures of several persons supposed to be connected with education in this State, but not one of them wore the friar's frock. And none of the wandering lecturers who so frequently come to enlighten Louisiana on her history and educational progress has begun at the beginning and told his audience of Father Cecil. And yet in giving a history of what rivermen call steamboating, any lecturer would tell of Robert Fulton, and search into his parentage, rightly believing that those who gave him being were glorified by his genius. They might say, like one¹ of his biographers, that, though born of Irish parents, "his remote ancestors were probably of Scottish origin." Had the educationalists heard of Father Cecil, they might deem it "probable" that his "remote ancestors" were of New England, and himself a priest like Wyclif. But that they completely ignore Father Cecil, shows that they have never heard of him.

Bienville, anxious to root families to the soil, and knowing that

¹ Mr. Rennick, who perhaps did not know that the remote Scotch were all Irish.

civilization depends largely on the careful training of girls, took extraordinary pains to secure capable teachers; and, as the best were to be found in convents,—religious being then the only persons who adopted teaching as a life profession,—he turned to his native Canada for *Sœurs Grises*. But to his great grief, his project proved impracticable. He consulted Father Beaubois, Superior of the Jesuits, a man of great zeal and energy. Their views were identical, and Beaubois offered to apply to the Ursulines of Rouen. After much negotiation, a treaty was concluded, September 13th, 1726, by which these ladies engaged to supply teachers and nurses for New Orleans. It was, then, through the Jesuits that the first school for girls and the first regular hospital were established in the Louisiana of La Salle, which extended from the Great Lakes to the Mexican Gulf, and from the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains.

A lady bearing the somewhat singular name of Tranchepain (*slice of bread*) was appointed Superior. Mother Tranchepain, a convert from Calvinism, had taken the veil among the Ursulines in Rouen, in 1699. The contradictions, disappointments, and trials that wait upon all great enterprises were not wanting to this. Bishops who at first approved of their design, afterwards refused to allow nuns of their respective dioceses to leave, and some were obliged to appeal to Cardinal Fleury.¹ Louis XV., of whom so little good can be said, was a generous patron of this work, as the *brève* or official letter setting forth its objects and conditions testifies. Here is an extract:

“His Majesty, wishing to favor everything that can contribute to the relief of the sick and the education of the young, has approved the treaty made between the Company of the Indies and the Ursuline Religious, the intention of His Majesty being that they should enjoy, without interference, all that has been or shall be granted to them by the said Company. His Majesty takes them under his protection and safeguard, and in proof of his good will has commanded the hastening of the present Letters Patent, which he has willed to sign with his own hand.—Fontainebleau, September 18th, 1726.”

All the nuns for the Louisiana mission assembled in the monastery of Hennebon, in Brittany, to acknowledge as Superior Marie Tranchepain of St. Augustin, January 1st, 1727. Their action was confirmed by two letters from the Bishop of Quebec, Monseigneur Delacroix, one to Mother Tranchepain, the other to Father Beaubois. Louisiana was in his diocese, Quebec being under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Rouen. The missionary

¹ Almost all the Ursulines in France were volunteers in the good cause, and those obliged to remain at home had a holy envy of those selected for this perilous mission.

nuns were twelve. They gave their submission according to their respective ranks, eager to sacrifice themselves for the glory of God and the salvation of their fellow creatures, and filled with a holy enthusiasm which helped them in their sublime vocation. Two, at least, the Mother Superior and the novice, Madeleine Hachard, of Rouen, have left in their "Relations" evidence not only of sincere devotion to God and ardent zeal for souls, which they possessed in common with the rest, but also of liberal scholarship, fine culture, and unusual intellectual ability.

The terms offered by the Indian Company under whose auspices they were to sail, evince great interest in the sick and the children. They travelled at the expense of the Company, and each received, before embarking, a gift of 500 livres. Until their plantation should be in full cultivation, each was guaranteed 600 livres a year. A fine convent in course of erection was given them in perpetuity. Three nuns were to be always at the service of the hospital; one was set aside for the free school, and one to help her in case of overwork. It was expressly stipulated that those in charge of the sick and the free schools must not be disturbed. This shows that New Orleans was scarcely founded when provision of the most liberal and excellent description was made for the education of the "masses." Should the nuns, through want of health, or any other cause, wish to return to France, they were free to go at the expense of the Company. But not one looked back after having put her hand to the plough.

III.

On the 27th of January, 1727, the nuns looked their last on Paris, whence they journeyed to L'Orient, delayed by execrable road and bad weather, but bright and cheerful under all contrarieties. On February 22d, a day since memorable in the history of the United States, they bade adieu to their country, "for the glory of God and the salvation of the poor savages." They sailed in the *Gironde* with the Jesuit Fathers, Tartarin and Doutreleau, and "Frère Crucy," who, with Madeleine Hachard, being the youngest of the party, considered it "their duty to amuse the rest." No words of ours can describe, nor would it be easy to imagine in these days of rapid travel, Pullman boudoirs and ocean palaces, the sufferings of those "who went down to the sea in ships" a hundred and sixty years ago. The voyage had its chroniclers; every incident is vividly described in the letters and diaries of Mother Tranchepain and Sister Hachard, which have most unaccountably escaped the researches of the historians and romancists of Louisiana. These ladies, first teachers of Louisiana, wrote with ease and elegance, and a grace and liveliness which the lecturers who expatiate so perseveringly on the benighted times of old could not, we fear, equal.

It would take too long to give details of this seven months' journey from Paris to New Orleans, over the stormy Atlantic, among the West Indian Isles, on the Caribbean Sea and the Gulf of Mexico, and up the Mississippi.¹ Now they were threatened with a watery grave, again with starvation and thirst; once the ship barely escaped hostile corsairs, later they encountered savages of so peculiarly ferocious a type that they murdered by slow tortures all the whites they captured, and made every victim drink his own blood.

Probably no scene on earth is so bleak and dreary as the entrance from the Gulf to the Mississippi. An interminable waste of waters, a vast morass impassable for man or beast, shoals and sand bars, low strips of coast covered with poplars, prairies of reeds, a wilderness of cane-brakes—the mouths of the river were then strewn with driftwood and half choked with wrecks. As they ascended, forests that seemed coëval with the creation; here and there a solitary hut for pilots, stretches of green savannah, gaunt trunks of trees stuck fast in the sand, snags, to-day the *crux* of the river-man, gigantic cyprus shrouded in funereal moss, half submerged in the yellow waves. Gloom and magnificence everywhere mingled; fishes disporting themselves ruffled the old-gold surface of the melancholy river; blue cranes like flying skeletons hovered about the masts; swarthy, half nude natives in pirogues and chaloupes glided among the wondrous waves, shimmering in the mystic charm of the summer sunlight. But dreadful was the navigation of the lower Mississippi in those days. "The trials and fatigues of our five months' sea voyage," writes one novice, "are not to be compared with what we had to endure in our journey from the Gulf to New Orleans, a distance of thirty leagues."

As the Sisters neared their future home, the flat monotony of the landscape was agreeably diversified by masses of dark foliage, sparkling at night with fire-flies, which made a gorgeous illumination. Planters' houses squatting among the half cleared areas—huge, unwieldy structures, wide halls dividing their whole length,—the river beating against the edge of the miry ground and threatening to submerge it; right joyfully were the travellers welcomed by the *habitans*, "honest people from France or Canada, who will send us their children." "They are enthusiastic over our arrival, because they will not now be obliged to go to France to educate their daughters."

The nuns reached New Orleans on August 7th, 1727. An early writer has described the village as a vast sink or sewer. It was surrounded by a deep ditch, and fenced with sharp stakes, wedged

¹ The Spanish annals add to the trials of their voyage the cruelty of the Captain, but no mention is made of this in the letters of Madeleine Hachard.

closely together. Tall reeds and coarse grasses grew in the streets, and a stone's throw from the rickety church reptiles hissed, and wild beasts and malefactors lurked, protected by impenetrable jungle. One novice gives a flattering description of the town: "It is very handsome, well-built and regularly laid out. . . . The streets are wide and straight; the houses wainscoted and latticed, the roofs supported by white-washed pillars and covered with shingles, that is, thin boards cut to resemble slates and imitating them to perfection. . . . The colonists sing that our town is as beautiful as Paris. But I find a difference. The songs may persuade those who have never seen the capital of France. But I have seen it, and they fail to persuade me."

The tropical gorgeousness of the vegetation charmed her. The country, save for a small space about the church, was thickly wooded to the water's edge, and the trees were of prodigious height. The streets and squares, laid out by the engineer, La Tour, were still mostly on paper only. The air was on fire with mosquitoes, every one provided with a sting like a fine, red hot nail. Yet she found the climate balmy and soothing, and readily believed the boast of the Creoles that it was the most salubrious on earth. She remarks that those who had given the nuns a poor idea of the place had not seen its progress for several years. The tremendous hurricane of 1723 had swept away the cabins in which the earliest settlers had found a miserable shelter. And the town was rebuilt on a scale of modest splendor which surprised and delighted the nuns.

Mother Tranchepain dilates on her joy and consolation on touching the soil of New Orleans: "We set out for Father Beaubois' house, and met him coming towards us, leaning on a staff, because of his weakness. He looked pale and weary, but on seeing us brightened up"—he was recovering from a dangerous illness. A crayon sketch, kindly lent the writer by the amiable successor of Mother Tranchepain, gives a lively representation of the "Landing of the Ursulines." The nuns are in procession, wearing the ample garb of their Order. Sister Hachard's fine, strong lineaments are partially concealed by the flowing white veil of a novice. F. Beaubois presents them to the Capuchin pastors of the town, and points out the Indians and negroes, their future charges. A negress holding a solemn ebony baby regards the group with awe and wonderment. A beautiful squaw, decked with beads and shells, surrounded by plump papooses, half reclines with natural grace on some logs, and a very large Congo negro has dropped his work and betaken himself to the top of a woodpile to gaze leisurely on the scene. Claude Massy, an Ursuline postulant, carries a cat which she tenderly caresses; another, "Sister Anne," is searching a basket for

something. Both wear the high peaked Normandy cap. Franciscans heavily bearded, and Jesuits in large cloaks, appear in the distance. Immense trees, which have long since disappeared, overshadow the whole group. The picture is a most interesting and valuable relic, probably the only one in existence which shows *tout ensemble* the first schoolmasters and schoolmistresses of any country, and its earliest preachers of the Gospel of Peace.

The nuns breakfasted with F. Beaubois. Governor Perier, Madame Perier, and all the chief people welcomed them as risen from the dead, for they had been given up as lost. Bienville's country house, the best in the colony, given them provisionally, was a two story edifice with a flat roof, used as a belvedere or gallery, situated on Bienville street, which runs perpendicularly to the river, between Royal and Chartres streets, which are parallel to it. Six doors gave ingress and egress to the apartments on the ground floor. Large and numerous windows, with sashes covered with fine linen, let in as much light as glass. The garden opened on Bienville street. From the roof the nuns might gaze on a scene of weird and solemn splendor. Swamps and clumps of palmetto and tangled vines; the surrounding wilderness with groups of spreading live oaks (*chênières*), cut up by glassy bayous, was the home of reptiles, wild beasts, vultures, herons, and many wondrous specimens of the *fauna* of Louisiana. Here were flocks of the pelican, fabled to feed its young from its bosom, and chosen as a symbol of the teeming soil of Louisiana as it had been chosen from earlier times as a beautiful type of Jesus, *pius pelicanus*, who feeds His children with His own Sacred Body and Blood. Our novice makes the immense trees, which surround the garden, responsible for the terrible atoms she calls *frappes d'abord*, "which sting without mercy and threaten to assassinate us." They came at sunset and, after preying on the nuns all night, returned to the woods at sunrise.

The holy sacrifice of the Mass was offered for the first time in the temporary convent, August 9th, 1727, by F. Beaubois, who acted as chaplain to the little community. In accordance with their earnest desire, he placed the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle which their deft fingers had lovingly prepared, October 5th. They were the only consecrated virgins in the vast region now known as the United States, and it would not be easy to imagine their emotion when, bowed down before the Awful Presence, they offered reparation to the Sacred Heart of Jesus for the indifference or sinfulness of the multitude, and besought the Fountain of all mercies to bestow the gift of Faith on the savages they had come so far to reclaim.

This, then, was the first girls' school established in Louisiana.

It was but a few squares from the venerable hovel on the south of the church, where Father Cecil taught the boys of the town. As to air, light, spaciousness, and picturesqueness, there is not a finer site in Louisiana to-day. It was established primarily as a free school. The receiving of the rich as boarders was an after-thought. "When the Religious find it convenient," says a contemporary document, "they may take paying pupils, if they judge proper." But it was expressly stipulated that the nuns in charge of the free schools and the sick "should not be put to teach in the pension school." So that the free school, instead of being the outgrowth of a new idea due to our northern friends, is contemporaneous with the colonization of Louisiana.

The Sisters at once began to teach the children and extend their cares to the sick, the Indians and the blacks. Sister Hachard praises the docility of the children, "who can be moulded as one pleases." She says it is easy to instruct the negroes once they learn French, but "impossible to baptize the Indians without trembling, on account of their natural propensity to evil, particularly the squaws who, under an air of modesty, hide the passions of beasts." The Religious were valued throughout the colony as the most precious gift the mother country could bestow. They were loaded with presents. Governor Perier and his amiable wife often visited them. The Intendant, Delachaise, who "commanded for the king in the absence of the governor," is described as a perfect gentleman "who refuses nothing we ask of him." "The marks of protection we receive from the highest in the land cause us to be respected by the whole population. This, 'continues our acute novice,' would not last long if we did not sustain by our actions the exalted opinion they have of us."

IV.

The community which thus auspiciously began the work of education in Louisiana consisted of eight professed members,¹ one novice, and two candidates. "Never," says our novice, "was any other community so well accommodated in the beginning of its existence." The house soon became too small for the number of pupils, ever increasing. A solid brick convent of ample dimensions was in course of construction at the other extremity of the town. The Indian Company promised to have it ready in six months, which space lengthened out to seven years. The gentlemen who had begun with so much diligence grew weary of well-doing.

¹ 1, Mother M. Augustine Tranchepain; 2, Sisters Margu  rite Judde; 3, Marianne Boulanger; 4, Madeleine de Mahieu; 5, Ren  e Singuel; 6, Marguerite de Talaon; 7, Cecilia Cavelier; 8, Marianne Dain; 9, Madeliene Hachard; Claude Massy, and a candidate styled simply Sister Anne.

Neither tears nor solicitations could prevail on them to supply material and finish the work. The nuns grew disheartened. They had no pecuniary means to forward it, and it was with difficulty they contrived to live in a new country where the prices of provisions were enormous. "God, whose designs are impenetrable," writes the annalist, "permitted that several who had worked hardest in this enterprise should die before the accomplishment of their desires." A most efficient member, Sister Madeleine de Mahieu, died July 6th, 1728; Mother Margeurite Judde followed, August 14th, 1731, and Sister Marguerite Talaon, September 5th, 1733. On November 11th, 1733, the brave and gentle Superior, Mother Augustine Tranchepain, "submitted to the same penalty, and like another Moses, expired in sight of the promised land." However ardent her desires of seeing the accomplishment of a work which she had so happily begun, she met death with edifying firmness, and was in a manner angry with those who showed some expectation of her recovery.

Not a stone upon a stone remains of the dwellings consecrated by the joys and sorrows of that heroic band, exiles for Christ. Bienville's villa, Father Cecil's venerable school-house, the church, the monk's convent and library, the arsenal and town-hall, perished in the dreadful conflagration of Good Friday, 1788, which swept away nearly nine hundred houses, leaving thousands homeless. Tradition asserts that the nuns lived some time on their plantation, and points out *Nun* street, a short street flanked with cotton presses and opening on the *Levéé*, as the site of their country house. The nomenclature of the streets that form a net-work over what is supposed to have been the Ursuline plantation recalls the holy souls who prayed and taught within its limits, *Religious St.*, *Notre Dame St.*, *Annunciation St.*, *Teresa St.*, etc.

The hospital of the Sisters usually had from thirty to forty patients, mostly soldiers. And everything was so well arranged that the officials said it was useless for them to continue their visits—there was nothing for them to do. At first the infirmarian watched the nurses, but ere long she took sole charge. The sick could not say enough in praise of their "mothers," who would even gratify their tastes when it could be done without prejudice to their health. "We bless God for the success of this Christian work," writes the chronicler, "The spirit of our holy institute shows itself in the good our Sisters do for souls while attending to the wants of the body." Like all nuns who serve the sick, they were consoled by many wonderful conversions.

It was on a fair summer evening, the air cool and balmy after days of incessant rain, that the nuns took possession of their new convent, July 13th, 1734, the first built on the delta of the Missis-

issippi, and the oldest in the United States by some seventy years. Great progress had been made in the education of the young at this early epoch. Improvements had been introduced everywhere. In the culture of fruits and vegetables, immense advances had been made; figs, grapes, pine-apples, melons, oranges, sweet and sour, beans, potatoes, were quite common. The Jesuits cultivated many rare varieties, and their gardens, hedged with wax myrtle, now the site of the richest quarter in New Orleans, were the wonder and delight of the colony. Madeleine Hachard speaks of the immense quantities of fruit sent to the convent, which the nuns, aided by their pupils, made into jellies and preserves. As early as April 24th, 1728, she tells her father, at Rouen, that Father Beaubois' garden, the finest in the town, is full of orange trees. During Holy Week, the nuns and their pupils gave evidence of progress in music: "We had exhortations attended by nearly two hundred persons. The *Tenebræ* and the *Miserere* were sung; at Easter we had the whole Mass set to music, with quartettes admirably executed. The convents in France, with all their brilliancy, seldom do as much." The nuns had twenty boarders, three parlor-boarders, three orphans, and seven slave-boarders, "whom we instruct and prepare for Baptism and First Communion," a large number of day scholars, besides "many black and Indian women, *who attend our school every day for two hours.*" It was usual for girls to marry at thirteen or fourteen, but henceforth no girl was allowed to marry without first being instructed by the nuns.

They received under their protection the orphans of the Frenchmen recently massacred at Natchez, and some *Filles à la cassette* (girls with a trunk or casket), sent hither by the king as wives for respectable colonists and soldiers. These poor girls had scarcely tasted their hospitality when they were claimed by men in need of helpmates. The marriages made on so short an acquaintance usually turned out well. Even girls from French Houses of Correction became excellent wives and mothers, perhaps because they were instructed by the Sisters previous to receiving the seventh sacrament. F. Beaubois expected that the Ursulines would establish religion throughout the colony by their good example and instructions. The Acadians also enjoyed their hospitality, but this was later.

Their removal to their new monastery was the occasion of one of the most elegant pageants ever devised in the city of pageants, one which shows conclusively that the Louisianians had taken, as it were naturally, such culture as the Ursulines were able to give. To-day, after all that has been said about the decoration in art and the æsthetic everywhere, we doubt if anything more chaste, yet stirring and showy, could be devised, great though our resources be.

From July 2d, the nuns had been looking in vain for favorable weather. A down-pour, lasting three days, began on the 9th, flooding gardens and making roads impassable. On Saturday, 13th, just as they had resolved to postpone their departure indefinitely, the sun burst from the cloudy heavens, and in his brilliant light and tropical heat the waters soon subsided. The sudden clearing of the sky they took as a good omen, and at 5 p.m. all their bells rang out to announce their intended departure. Bienville, whose third term (1733-1743) had recently begun, soon appeared in the convent chapel, where the nuns knelt for the last time. Fathers Beaubois and Petit, and Brother Parisel, Jesuits; Fathers Philip and Pierre, Capuchins, and the most distinguished people of the place surrounded the brilliantly lighted altar, and the troops, half French, half Swiss, drew up on either side of the old convent.¹

V.

Father Philip gave benediction, assisted by Fathers Beaubois and Petit. All left the chapel processionally, the citizens opening the march, Then came the children of the orphanage and the day-school, followed by forty of the principal ladies of the city, bearing torches; next twenty young girls robed and veiled in the purest white, and twelve others, representing St. Ursula and her 11,000 companions. The boarders, orphans, and day pupils carried wax tapers. The young lady who personated St. Ursula wore a costly robe and a regal mantle of tissue of silver. Her crown glittered with pearls and diamonds, and a veil of the richest lace fell about her in graceful folds. She bore in her hand a heart pierced with arrows made with wondrous skill. Fair children arrayed as angels surrounded her, and all waved palm branches emblematic of the glorious victory won by the heroic virgin-martyrs whom they had the honor to represent.

Lastly came the Religious with lighted candles, and the clergy carrying a rich canopy, under which the Most Blessed Sacrament was borne in triumph. Bienville and his staff, the Intendant, Mons. Salmon, and the whole population formed their escort. The soldiers moved in single file on each side, about four feet from the procession. Hymns were sung by all, the accompaniment of fifes and drums making pleasing harmony; Brother Parisel, in surplice, acted as master of ceremonies, and perfect order and decorum prevailed. This moving panorama of light, color, and beauty halted between the church and the *Place d'Armes*, and defiled gracefully into the aisles, the troops kneeling and presenting arms to do honor

¹ From the old convent, the villa of Bienville, to the new, the distance is less than a mile, along Chartres street. The southern part of Chartres street, on which the new monastery, now a very old one, is situated, was then Condé street.

to the Blessed Sacrament. The nuns knelt within the sanctuary. Father Philip placed the *Veiled Saviour* on the altar, and the clergy knelt in lowly adoration. Soldiers robed as acolytes were swinging censers whose delicate perfumes filled the church. The congregation remained prostrate till Father Petit, S. J., the orator of the occasion, arose to address them. In a sermon described as most eloquent by the nun whose facile pen has embalmed these precious details, he set forth the necessity and advantages of giving young persons a solid Christian education. In glowing words he congratulated the nuns on their labors to this great end, so conducive to the glory of God and the welfare of the Colony. At the close of this touching address, the soldiers sang hymns to the Blessed Sacrament and St. Ursula. They then fell down before their hidden Lord with such demonstrations of reverence that a spectator, not given to mild views, feared their interior dispositions did not correspond with all this exterior respect.

The torches and tapers were not superfluous when the procession wound out of the church; the sun was setting, but the after glow remained for a while, burnishing the lofty trees and turning the mighty river into molten gold. It drew up before the *Place d'Armes*,¹ and the bells of the new monastery rang out their merriest peals as it moved slowly in the deepening twilight, not ceasing till all had entered the sacred edifice, a few squares distant. "Thus did we enter our new abode," writes the chronicler, "amid the chiming of bells, the music of fifes and drums, and the singing of praise and thanksgiving to our heavenly Father whose loving Providence has lavished on us so many favors." Benediction was given a third time. As it was late and "insufferably warm," the *Te Deum* was deferred to the next day, Sunday. "The people withdrew, apparently pleased and edified, and we were delighted to find ourselves once more secluded from the world and all its loves and esteems."

The first day our good Religious spent in their new home, the Blessed Sacrament was exposed and a solemn *Te Deum* was sung. In the evening there was benediction and "we sang a mottet that won the admiration of the distinguished people who assisted at these ceremonies. We were really charmed with our new house," continued our anonymous chronicler; "much is yet to be done, but the joy of being separated from the world outweighs all inconveniences." Father Dagobert, who came to New Orleans in 1723, lived to witness a more stirring and pompous procession. Thirty-five years later, August 18th, 1769, he watched the superb battalions and *fusileros* of Don Alexandro O'Reilly crossing the *plaza*

¹ *Place d'Armes*, a field before the church, called in Spanish colonial times the *plaza*, now Jackson Square.

to the military mass and *Te Deum* which were to celebrate the transfer of Louisiana to Spain. The hoarse roaring of cannon mingled with the mellow tones of all the bells in the town as they rang out a joyous welcome to the hero of the day. O'Reilly, who worthily represented the potent majesty of Spain, attended by a staff of gorgeously accoutred men, preceded by officers bearing massive silver maces, moved forward to the music of hundreds of instruments. When they halted to be officially welcomed by the representatives of the Church, the prolonged shouts which rent the air, *Viva el Rey*, were heard in the cloisters of St. Ursula. The Friar received His Excellency at the church-door, welcomed him with every demonstration of respect, and with utmost enthusiasm promised fidelity to the crown of Spain for his brethren and the people. He then blessed the Spanish colors which ascended the flag-staff when the white banner was lowered. When that redoubtable chieftain bent his pale intellectual countenance radiant with devotion, and knelt with forehead to the earth at the *Te ergo quæsumus*, perhaps he thought no scene could be grander or more thrilling than that of which he formed the central figure. Or, it may be, that, like another warrior of the same race, his triumphs had a tinge of bitterness because they were not for the land of his birth and his love. But I fancy Father Dagobert's mind reverted to the procession of 1734, and that, however thrilled and overawed by the warlike grandees of Spain and the princely Irishman who commanded them, his heart preferred the earlier and lovelier pageant.

The whole scene of July 13th, 1734, intensely dramatic as it was, passes before our mind's eye in its quaint and gorgeous beauty. Civilians in the graceful costume of that era, officials in their showy robes of office, matrons in grand toilettes of the rich gold-striped stuffs that surprised Madeleine Hachard on her first introduction to the women of the Colony—soldiers in gaudy uniforms, veterans wearing medals of gallantry won on many a field in Europe; dignitaries with black servants in bright liveries; Bienville attended by a splendid staff; children in purest white strewing flowers before the Blessed Sacrament; young girls richly appareled, "St. Ursula" in sparkling diadem and royal robes waving the graceful palmetto of the country. Dark-robed nuns, in flowing veils and mantles, led by Sister Hachard, whose clever pen has left such vivid pictures of early colonial days—acolytes in bright cassocks and snow-white surplices, swinging silver thuribles—bearded Franciscans in the brown habits of their Order, Jesuits in simple soutanes, the officiating clergy in glittering vestments—the rich canopy borne aloft, soldiers in Indian file, keeping step as a guard of honor, between whose lines passed the hidden God. The rich sonorous

voices of the men, the clear, sweet treble of the women and children, the martial music of the soldiery; the eager-eyed blacks and the swarthy Indians who see in this old-world grandeur a picture of heaven, and the warm beams of the sun gilding the whole; the giant trees whose branches bend low as if in adoration of the *Veiled Presence* beneath the canopy, the red sunbeams glittering through the foliage and forming halos over St. Ursula and her Virgin Companions; the cardinal birds like tufts of fire in the trees, the mocking birds making sweet melody in their hiding places; the clouds of incense ascending heavenward—all this must have equalled in beauty and variety any other religious display ever devised, and speaks volumes for the culture of Louisiana in French Colonial days.

VI.

The Ursulines seem to have been particularly successful in developing and cultivating the musical tastes of their pupils. The women, the children, and the soldiers could, as we have seen, unite with the clergy and the sisters in singing and moving forward to the accompaniment of military music; and it is always trying to sing while marching, however slowly. It would be interesting to see the scores from which they sang and to which they marched. Perhaps they lie unnoticed in some secret drawer of the Ursuline library. This display shows that congregational singing is not an innovation in New Orleans; it evidently entered largely into the worship of the early settlers.

The nuns were able to afford increased educational facilities to their pupils in their new home. The good wrought by them increased every day, and parents were influenced through their pupils. The blacks, then very few, and the Indians who came and went at will, were tenderly cherished. Mother Melotte, who succeeded Mother Tranchepain, was a woman of great energy and did much to improve and beautify the monastery, and fit it for its many purposes. Laundry, store-room, bakery, a small parlor, and a room for the *tourrière*, still standing, were added in quick succession, The day scholars increasing, new school-rooms followed. The convent was built to stand sieges—attacks from the Indians or the English were almost always expected. And as it was incongruous that such a structure should be surrounded by a fence of stakes, the good Mother, at a cost of 6000 francs, built a brick wall around the whole enclosure, part of which still stands. All this was done at the expense of the nuns, who were surprised that the sum charged to the building accounts, 100,000 francs, did not supply all the offices and include a hospital. Those who know the old monastery will be interested to hear that the ground-floor had a small

chapel, two parlors, a room for the Mother Superior, refectories for the sisters and the boarders, community rooms, kitchen, scullery, and pantry. On the next floor, first in English, second in French, were dormitory, infirmary, sacristy, linen room, wardrobe. The orphans occupied part of the upper story; the rest was used as an instruction room for the colored women. "We succeeded in persuading the gentlemen of the Indian Company," writes one of the nuns, "to erect a separate building for the sick." To this the patients were removed, August 20th, 1734. It was behind the convent, facing Arsenal street, which immediately changed its name to Hospital street. The first infirmarian, Sister M. Xavier, before assuming the charge, wished to see how the lay nurses managed the sick. "But her apprenticeship was short, for charity compelled her to take sole charge of them." Heretofore, only patients in danger of death had been received, but the new building was spacious enough to accommodate all the sick. Such were the humble beginnings of the splendid Charity Hospital, which is not the least of the glories of New Orleans.

VII.

The educational advantages given by the Ursulines to girls of every class may perhaps be the cause why the Creole women of Louisiana have been regarded by many as morally, religiously, and even intellectually superior to the Creole men. But it was not Bienville's fault that there was no high school or university for boys. Rich parents sent their sons to Europe, and the benefits of such a course were not always commensurate with its risks and expenses. The truly enlightened founder of the city sought the best teachers for the boys, as he had done for the girls. He wrote to the French Government, in 1742:

"It is long since the inhabitants of Louisiana made representations on the necessity of having a college for the education of their sons. Convinced of the advantages of such an institution, they wished the Jesuits to undertake its creation and management. It is essential that there be one at least for the study of classics, geometry, geography, pilotage, etc. It is too evidently demonstrated to parents how utterly worthless children turn out who are reared in idleness and luxury, and how ruinously expensive it is to send children to France to be educated. Moreover, it is to be feared that Creoles educated abroad will imbibe a dislike to their native country and come back only to receive and convert into cash the property left by their parents."

The Intendant Salmon made this petition jointly with the Governor, but it was set aside as premature. Bienville left the Colony for France on May 10th, 1743, never to return. As he had always

labored for the profit of Louisiana, it may well be believed that he used his influence in Paris to advance the project he had so much at heart. But the times were unfavorable, and every year increased the difficulties of its execution.

The sun of St. Ignatius was already beginning to set. The suppression of his children throughout the French dominions loomed up in the distance, and years of anxiety and persecution were preparing minds for that final issue. So far from being able to found another establishment in New Orleans, they were soon to be driven from a Colony in which they had labored with signal success from its earliest days. The Jesuit College, for which Governor Bienville asked, was not founded till late in the next century. The formal order for the suppression of the Jesuits was issued by the French Government in 1764, and their brethren in Spain and Naples shared the same fate. The plantation which their labors had wrung from marsh and swamp and changed into a garden of Eden was confiscated by an ungrateful government to which their property in Louisiana brought 180,000 dollars, an enormous sum for the time. They had introduced sugar-cane, which later became a fruitful source¹ of wealth to Louisiana, "the sugar-bowl of the United States." By the lamentable exodus of so many zealous priests, the nuns lost their directors and best friends, and education in Louisiana its most influential and cultured patrons. Madeleine Hachard was spared this great sorrow. She died in 1762, after having faithfully taught the youth of the Colony for thirty five years. The letters of this accomplished woman show her to have been full of high and generous sentiments, and ardently devoted to her holy vocation.

The administration of the generous and hospitable successor of Bienville, the Marquis de Vaudreuil, the Grand Marquis, as he was styled, was a period of unusual brilliancy, 1743-1753, though not without its disturbances. He was succeeded by Kerlerec, a captain in the French Navy. D'Abbadie, who followed, died in office in 1765. This year was signalized by the arrival of 650 Acadians who, after being hospitably received in New Orleans, were sent to Opelousas and Attakapas, where their descendants remain to this day. By a secret Treaty of Cession, Louisiana was given over to Spain on February 10th, 1762. But Aubry, the last French governor, remained in the colony till he delivered it officially to O'Reilly, in 1769.

The despatches of the later French governors and other officials

¹ In 1882 the Louisiana sugar-crop netted 340,000,000 pounds. In that year 70,000,000 pounds were lost by the overflow of the Mississippi. The largest recorded sugar crop before the war was (in 1858) 500,000,000 pounds, and 30,000,000 gallons of molasses.

prove the colony to have been in a desperate condition. De Bas-sac tells the home government that "drunkenness,¹ brawls, and duels destroyed half the population." And D'Abbadie complains that the "facility offered by the country to live on its natural productions has created habits of laziness," that the "whole population is stupefied by the vice of drunkenness," and that "Louisiana is a chaos of iniquity and disorder." Kerlerrec, from his cell in the Bastile, "from the bottom of his heart pities" the Spanish Governor, Ulloa, for being sent to such a country. All this had a baleful influence on education. Those devoted to education, above all others, require peace of mind if they would make their work a success. The Ursuline Religious were always treated with great deference in the old colonial days. But it was difficult for teachers or pupils to attend well to school duties while the city Fathers were holding conventions, sending out deputations, and heading the armed squads that paraded the streets. Spain, having already too many colonies, was slow to take possession of the gift thrust upon her by the degenerate Louis XV., through his infidel minister, Choiseul, who had already lost Canada to France. The most excited condition of public feeling prevailed. Official reports state that anarchy was becoming almost universal. The people besought the king not to separate them from France. The aged Bienville made the same petition with tears, and, it is said, died of grief when Choiseul refused to grant it. The disturbances of the quasi-interregnum affected the cause of education most unfavorably. From 1760 to 1770 was a period of bitter agitation and controversy. The antecedents and consequents of the transfer to Spain disturbed the country socially and religiously as well as politically, and nowhere was the change more keenly felt than within the walls of the Ursuline convent. The nuns, mostly French by birth and attached to their country and her language, were given to understand that Spanish was to be henceforth the chief language of their schools. The Spanish domination² brought them Spanish subjects for whom they seem to have had about as much welcome as the French Friars for their Spanish brethren. Even the Indians complained of being "handed from one white chief to another like so many head of cattle."

Difficulties between clergy of different orders, and between French and Spanish clergy of the same order, and later, between clergy and their bishops, had a deleterious effect on education. The

¹ The drunkenness resulted from the immoderate use of *tafia*, a kind of bad whisky made from the sugar-cane.

² Four Spanish ladies from Havana took the veil in the Ursuline Convent, New Orleans, 1772. A church was built for the nuns at the expense of the King of Spain about the same time.

first Spanish governor, Don Antonio Ulloa, a scholar of European reputation, would doubtless have done much for education, had the people allowed him. But they arose in arms against him, and forced him to leave the country. "It is well known," wrote the Spanish minister, Grimaldi, regarding Ulloa's expulsion, "that the loss of great interest is looked upon in Spain with indifference, but not so as regards insults or contumelies." Charles III. decided to punish the insult offered to the Spanish crown, and enforce his authority. On August 18th, 1769, Don Alexandro O'Reilly, an officer of the highest rank in the armies of Spain, honored with the royal friendship and confidence, appeared before the town with twenty-four sail, and 2600 picked men, the flower of the Spanish troops. The mere sight of this armament, or rather the news of its approach, quelled the insurrection. Twelve ring-leaders were tried for high treason and found guilty. Their defence was that Ulloa, whom they had driven out, had not shown his credentials; that they had not taken the oath of allegiance, and that Spain had not formally taken possession. But it was proved that the Spanish flag had for years been floating at every post from the Balize to Illinois; that some of the accused had held their commissions from the king of Spain, and drew salaries from him while exciting revolt against him. Six were sentenced to death, one of whom died in prison, and six were banished.

Though O'Reilly¹ has been blamed by a few for suffering the law to take its course, yet, at the time, he was judged extremely merciful. His powers were absolute; yet only a few of the leaders were punished, and a full, unconditional pardon was granted to the rest, *i.e.*, almost all the men in the colony. "I have the honor," wrote Aubry to the French Prime Minister, "of sending a list of the small number whom the General (O'Reilly) was indispensably obliged to have arrested. This proves his generosity and kindness of heart, considering there are many others whose criminal conduct would have justified their being treated in the same manner." Elsewhere he expresses astonishment that "the mere presence of one individual should have restored good order and tranquillity." And the Council of the Indies unanimously declared that "all the official acts of Count O'Reilly merited their most decided approbation, and were striking proofs of his extraordinary genius." With great liberality and profound policy, O'Reilly placed men of French birth or descent in all the chief offices of the State,² and sustained the French clergy in their charges.

¹ France gave Louisiana to Spain lest the English should seize it. Had an English governor come under the same circumstances as O'Reilly, what a butchery there would have been of the insurrectionists!

² A course diametrically opposite has always been pursued by the English in Ireland. Hence, while the Louisianians became thoroughly reconciled to the Spanish Domina-

It was at 3 P.M. on October 25th, 1769, that the five men who were to die were brought to the place of execution. Their sentence was read to them in Spanish, and repeated in French by John Kelly and John Garic, who had acted as interpreters at the trial. The firing of a platoon of grenadiers, distinctly heard by the terror-stricken Ursulines, ended their lives in a moment. It is a great pity that so humane a ruler as O'Reilly should have felt himself unable to restore order and at the same time spare the lives of these men to whom the law had decreed death. The widow¹ of the condemned who died in prison, Villeré, was the grand-daughter of Delachaise, the early benefactor of the nuns. When peace was restored, education flourished once more. O'Reilly soon brought order out of chaos. His romantic story and his wise and vigorous administration place him high among the small number born to rule. A ripe scholar, versed in the literature of many nations, he warmly patronised the existing schools, especially those of the Ursulines. New schools were established and some of the most learned professors of the universities of Spain came to New Orleans to preside over them. O'Reilly, who could have travelled from his native Meath to Moscow without an interpreter, pleased the people by addressing them in French, though he preferred the stately Castilian, which he spoke and wrote with classic purity of diction.² The officers associated with him in the government were all scholars of distinction, Gayarré, Navarro, and Loyola. The last claimed kindred with St. Ignatius, and was, like him, a model of knightly courtesy, a poet, and a valiant soldier of the cross. Don Joseph Loyola died in New Orleans in 1770.

Perhaps in succoring the Ursulines, to whom he was a generous benefactor, the poetic mind of O'Reilly and his truly Catholic heart wandered to a beauteous green isle, framed in sea-foam and draped with clouds, in which the song of cloistered virgins then seemed hushed forever. His entrance into New Orleans was a poem in itself, which must have recalled to his Celtic imagination the bare-armed Feni, the Ossianic heroes who haunt the shadowy past, and his ancestors in pre-historic Erin—dark-haired warriors wielding ponderous battle-axes, and white robed bards harping

tion, which was really a despotism very mildly administered, and for years after the American ascendancy would gladly have brought back the golden days of Spanish colonial rule, the Irish have never been satisfied with the English Government.

¹ Madame Villeré's brother, M. Delachaise, and the chief Creoles and Frenchmen of the colony immediately took office under O'Reilly, which would seem to show that they regarded the execution of the convicted men as a regrettable act of justice, and that O'Reilly's instructions from the king left him no choice in the matter. When O'Reilly wished to raise in the colony "The Regiment of Louisiana," the number of applicants exceeded the number to which he limited this corps.

² Hon. Charles Gayarré, great-grandson of O'Reilly's *contador*, showed the writer several autograph letters of this celebrated Irishman.

upon their harps of burnished gold. For this princely ruler was almost the last high priest of vanishing chivalry. In the oath of office he administered to his subordinates is a promise to defend the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, and never to take any fee from the poor.¹

Although the wants of the Ursulines were fully supplied, the king of Spain, perhaps on the representation of His Excellency Governor O'Reilly, insisted on paying the convent a pension for the support of two of the nuns, probably those who taught the free school. Meanwhile the English language, universal in Louisiana to-day, was slowly creeping in; it was largely spoken in Mobile, Pensacola, and Baton Rouge. From the earliest days the English had traded with the settlers on both sides of the river. They kept up the slave trade, and supplied planters with Africans of every tribe. Bienville himself had met them in the Mississippi when the village of Tchoutchouma occupied the site of New Orleans, and they were among the earliest pale faces the red men saw. Aubry, the last French governor, corresponded in English with the governors of other provinces. In 1769 O'Reilly wrote: "I drove off all the English traders and other individuals of that nation, whom I found in the town (New Orleans), and I shall admit none of their vessels." But despite the Spanish ascendancy and the gradual introduction of English, French continued to be the favorite language of the Ursuline nuns, and was taught to all their pupils, even after the city became *Nueva-Orleans*.

It does not fall within the scope of this article to follow the early teachers of Louisiana through the old Spanish colonial times or the first years of American domination. We will, therefore, conclude with a glance at the FIRST GIRLS' SCHOOL erected in Louisiana, still, battered and decayed as it is, one of the largest and strongest houses in the State. The devouring tooth of time has eaten into the blue-gray stucco which once covered its massive walls, but not a vestige of its old aspect has departed. Dozens of windows with small panes of greenish glass look out on its cool gardens. A queer shrine flanks the end of the centre walk. A patch of sugar cane, a few flowers that seem to have been blooming since the last century, and some antiquated fruit trees, bring the past vividly before the spectator. Once this garden stretched to the Mississippi, but now huge rows of ugly houses shut out the river view. Tradition points out where the nuns were buried; but all were removed

¹ Here is another of O'Reilly's regulations: "The governor with the Alcaldes, the Alguazil Mayor, and the *escribano*, shall yearly on the eves of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday, make a general visitation of the prisons. . . . They shall release those who have been arrested for criminal causes of small importance, or for debts, when such debtors are known to be insolvent, or shall allow them a sufficient term for the payment of their creditors."

to the new monastery grounds in 1824. The colored servants who were interred in the front of the convent were never disturbed. One would not like to eat the fruit of these gardens. For students have told their friends in mysterious whispers of a nun who sleeps beneath a certain cherry tree—she would not leave her ancient haunts; and of a supernatural spectre, “a ghost all in white” who roams about the grassy walks, and wails in the gloomy corridors, on certain high festivals. Nor would it surprise one who rambles through this old place to meet some spirit-nun on the broad, creaking staircase, with the thin iron balustrades, or in the large deserted rooms that once resounded with sweet children’s voices, and the hymns that charmed the simple Creoles of old colonial days.

We ascended the top story, once used as an instruction room for blacks. Imagination peoples it in a moment. There is the desk at which sat the brave and gentle teachers who had crossed the seas to bring these poor creatures to God. Dusky maidens and matrons come hither in crowds for advice, instruction, and consolation; their faces tell their tribes—the comely Yoloff, the treacherous Congo, the fierce Mandingo, the quarrelsome Banbarra, the intelligent Foulah,—all wearing the picturesque turbans of their full dress. And hither, too, crowd the Indian women, with a world of sorrow in their long, dark eyes. We descend; look through the various offices and people them with the gentle Sisters we know so well. We gaze on the clumsy gate with its small *grille* and quaint iron knocker, and think of some who passed through these faded portals. The early Jesuits and Franciscans, old Father Bienville, honest Perier and his pious wife. See how they crowd up from the dreamy past, not shadowy creatures from the twilight regions of romance, but beings real and human. The grand Marquis de Vandreuil in gilded casque and heron plume, the pensive *Filles alla-cassette*, the weeping Acadians, the chivalrous descendant of MacCarthy More, the scholarly Ulloa—the austere countenance of the princely O’Reilly, the dashing Galvez, the lordly O’Farrell, the intellectual face and piercing black eyes of Peñalvert,—that group of princes in the centre of which is the pear-shaped head¹ of Louis Philippe—the spare physiognomy of Andrew Jackson, lean and haggard from midnight vigils, but illumined and glorified by his eagle eye—how they all crowd upon the memory in this hallowed spot, so full of holy and historic associations. The prelates of New Orleans, except Bishop Peñalvert, have always been guests of the Ursulines, who have given them free use of this ancient mansion. But we, for one, could not carry inside these old walls the habits and sentiments of the last quarter of the nineteenth

¹ The future King of the French and his two brothers were in New Orleans in 1798.

century. The energy necessary to live and go forward to-day would ooze out through our finger-tips. We should be forever wandering in the shadowy past, dreaming dreams and seeing visions. The spirits conjured up by imagination would be more pleasant to us than the stern realities of every day life. Years would seem but as days when spent in sweet dalliance with many a fair wraith ascending from the old graves under the quivering trees, eluding our grasp and melting, in the calm sweet hours of even, into the dreamy moonlight. And, verily, to a poetic temperament, loving to revel in historic lore, the spectre-nun of the past wailing in the forsaken halls of the ancient monastery, yea, even the "ghost all in white," rising from her green couch under the cherry tree, would be a more pleasing companion than the tiresome votary of fashion, or the soulless worshipper of wealth, in which our age is so fertile.

THE SPIRITUAL IDEA IN DANTE'S *DIVINA COMMEDIA*.

I.

A STUDY of the *Divina Commedia*, in any of its aspects, must needs be a study of the age in which it was produced, of the man out of the fulness of whose soul it issued in notes strong and clear, and of the various influences that made their impress upon both the man and the poem. Of all the supreme efforts of creative genius, the *Divina Commedia* is that that can least be taken out of the times and circumstances that gave it birth. Its contemporary history and its contemporary spirit constitute its clearest and best commentary. In the light of this commentary we shall attempt to read its chief meaning and significance. Few poems admit of so many instructive interpretations; few so profitably repay earnest study. I take it, as a primary law of criticism, that if we can pluck from the heart of the poem its central conception and vivifying principle, we will not only grasp its meaning in the main, but we will also throw light upon many a dark corner within its structure. And in working along the line of its Spiritual Sense, will we be most likely to grasp that conception and verify that principle. Unfortunately, commentators have so buried the

beauty and meaning of the poem beneath the rubbish of conjecture and far-fetched interpretation, that its unity of plan and purpose has in great measure been lost sight of, and its true grandeur but rarely appreciated. In the present paper we first address ourselves to the man and his times; afterwards we consider the poem in its general spirit and bearing as the outcome of the times and the man; and finally, we endeavor to determine the philosophy and doctrine that are the foundation of its Spiritual Sense, and the nature, action, and outcome of that Sense.

II.

Dante was born in 1265; he died in 1326. Glance at what had been done before, and what was being done within, the compass of those years. Already the piety, zeal, and indomitable spirit of Innocent III. (Pope, 1198-1216) had caused the Papacy to be respected throughout Christendom and raised it to a high pinnacle of glory and prestige. It became the controlling power in Europe. St. Louis had led the final Crusade and died in a stranger's land (1270). The last faint echoes of the trumpet-voice that nigh two centuries before had aroused nations and hurled army after army upon the shores of Asia were now dying away within Dante's own hearing. The poet was born into stirring times. Feuds and factions were rife. They were handed down from sire to son and brought in their trail ruin, bloodshed, and desolation. City stood against city, province against province; and both city and province, town, hamlet and even house, were torn by internal dissensions. No man could escape being embroiled. No man could hold his head up and walk securely, a man among his fellow men, who did not share the responsibilities of his party, and carry out the vindictiveness of the house with which he was connected. Men were Blacks or Whites; they were Guelf or Ghibelline; they were Cerchi or Donati; they accordingly fought and suffered. This fact made the *Divina Commedia* possible; it gave it some of its color and helped to fashion it into its present shape. It brought Dante exile, poverty, suffering; it hardened him against his enemies; it inspired the gall and bitterness; but it also gave him the leisure to meditate and construct his great poem.¹

The age of Dante was preëminently a Catholic age. It was an age when men lived in one faith, had one ritual, recited one creed, were taught one and the same doctrine and practice, and breathed a common religious atmosphere. The Church extended the mantle of her care and charity over all orders of society and gave sanction

¹ "I went about," he tells us, "almost a beggar, showing against my will the wound of fortune, the blame of which frequently and unjustly is wont to be imputed to the person stricken."—Convito. Tratt i., cap. 3.

and benediction to institutions founded to meet the spiritual and corporal wants of Christ's poor. Dissenting sects and schools such as the Albigenses and Waldenses in France, the Cathari, Paterini, and disciples of Dolcino¹ in Italy, cropped out here and there, but they were the exception. The only recognized form of religion in every nation—that indeed upon which every Christian state in great measure was built—was the Catholic religion. Religion was the supreme affair with the men and women of that day. The world beyond the grave was to them an ever-present reality. Their thoughts and fancies dwelt in it. Their belief in it was intense. They, so to speak, touched it with their hands. It was a powerful factor in their lives. They might be guilty of great excesses—indeed theirs was an age of excesses—but sooner or later remorse overtook them and their atonement was as generous as their sins were enormous.² Religion was abused, but none the less manifest were its beneficial effects; vice was flagrant, but it never lost the sense of shame; men were cruel, but their cruelty was followed by sincere regrets; misfortunes were frequent and signal, but they were accepted with resignation or with the hope of retrieval, or men gloried in them on account of the cause in which they suffered. "Religion," says Tommaseo, "was not separated from morality, nor science from life, nor were words from deeds."³ Such was life at that day; such do we find it exemplified in the person of the poet and embodied in his poem.

This religious spirit inspired the chivalry of the day. Knights passed from land to land in search of adventure, vowed to protect and defend the widow and the orphan and the lonely or oppressed woman at the hazard of their lives; they went about with a prayer on their lips and in their heart the image of the lady-love whom they had chosen to serve and to whom they had pledged loyalty and fidelity; they strove to be chaste in body and soul, and as a tower of strength for the protection of this spirit of chastity they were taught to venerate the Blessed Mother of God and cultivate towards her a tender devotion as the purest and holiest ideal of womanhood. This spirit of chivalry is the ruling spirit of Dante's life and the inspiration of some of his sublimest flights. As the knight wore the color of the lady of his heart and proclaimed her transcendent qualities to all comers, even so did Dante, in the same spirit, proclaim the beauty and loveliness and virtue of his Beatrice beyond all compare.

¹ Inferno, xxviii., 55. Villani, viii., 14.

² Guido da Montefeltro after a life of violence becomes a Franciscan Friar. See *L'Inferno*, xxvii., 67-129.

³ *La Divina Commedia*, Commentata da Niccolo Tommaseo. *L'Inferno*, Art. II secolo di Dante, p. xx.

This religious spirit inspired men and women to go on long and and wearisome pilgrimages. Every shrine of prayer had its votaries. With staff and scrip, and in all humility and earnestness; in a prayerful spirit, in penance for sin, for the healing of soul or body, with the view of obtaining through the intercession of a favorite saint some special grace, they walked to the place of pilgrimage and there in vigils and fastings besought heaven in their behalf. The practices and expressions of pilgrimages became part of men's thinking. They entered into the language of spiritual life. Life itself came to be regarded as a pilgrimage to the heavenly Jerusalem. And in this allegory do we find the key to one meaning running through the *Divina Commedia*.

This religious spirit gave direction to the studies of the day. It was the inspiration of the teachers of the age. It caused to bud and bloom the great thoughts of the great thinkers of this great epoch. Pope and king vie with each other in founding universities and schools.¹ It is an age of inquiry and disputation; but over all preside faith and piety. The schools are filled to overflowing. The great philosophic lights, Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura, both die in the eventful ninth year of Dante's life (1274). Albertus Magnus dies when Dante is in his fifteenth year (1280); Roger Bacon, when the poet is in his twenty-ninth year. These men represent all that was grandest, noblest, and best in the thought of the schools. Contemporary with our poet were lesser lights, but none the less great thinkers and instigators to thought: Raymond Lully (1244-1305), Duns Scotus (1274-1308), Ockham (d. 1345). The light of these men set Christendom aglow. Thought was quickened. The very atmosphere vibrated with Scholastic disputations. It was the golden era of Scholasticism. Dante made careful study of the writings of these great thinkers. Some of them he may have heard discourse and expound; for he attended the Schools and entered into the discussions that were then considered so essential an element of study and criterion of proficiency. We learn from Boccaccio how strong in the poet was the spirit of study: "In his eagerness to know, he heeded neither heat nor cold, nor vigils, nor fasts, nor any other bodily inconvenience." He retained that spirit, with few intermissions, through life. The writings of his contemporaries and their instructors—especially those of Aquinas and Bonaventura—became his daily food, and they are the basis

¹ In Dante's own day we see Boniface VIII. establish the University known as the Sapienza. We may, in justice to a much-maligned man, and as an antidote to the bitterness of Dante's verses against him, quote the following tribute: "Religion owes to him the consoling institution of the Jubilee; ecclesiastical jurisprudence, the sixth book of the Decretals; and general science, the foundation of the Roman university known as the Sapienza." Darras's History of the Church, vol. iii., p. 456. See Darras's larger work continued by L'Abbé J. Bareille, t. xxx. pp. 18-124.

of his great poem.¹ Nor did he forget Plato and Aristotle so far as they were known and understood in his day. The Stagyrte he calls the master of those who know, and next him in the philosophic family he places Socrates and Plato.² Much there was in the discussions of this period that was purely curious, silly, of small edification and of no profit; much also was there that we of the present may study with advantage; much indeed must there have been that was noble and suggestive, since it was the epoch that built the Gothic Cathedral, dictated the *Summa Theologica*, and inspired the *Divina Commedia*.

III.

Thus it was that over all presided Religion. Religion was the Time-spirit of that age. It permeated thought and word and work. This fact we must bring home to ourselves if we would understand the scope of the great poem under consideration. A word upon the evolution of this spirit may not be out of place. Pagan Rome attained her rounded civilization by reason of the fact that all the elements in the State, whether literary, or political, or religious, or social, or industrial, or artistic, were bound up in harmony, and were subservient to the one, universal, all-absorbing idea of Rome. Everything in life and conduct, in religion and morals, was sacrificed to the will, the safety and the glory of Rome. Then came Christianity. It entered as a disturbing element. It brought not peace and concord, but discord and the sword. It undid the harmony existing between the State, religion and human passion. It taught men to make war upon their unruly passions, and upon the corpse of slain evil inclinations, to walk in the road of self-denial to a higher spiritual life undreamed of in the religion of pagan Rome. That God was more than man, the soul more than the

¹ The depth and accuracy of Dante's theological knowledge is something marvellous. The terseness and grasp with which he handles the most abstruse subjects has never been excelled, and has never ceased to elicit the admiration of competent judges. Epitaphs are not always correct; but ages of study and investigation have confirmed that upon the poet's tomb at Ravenna; all are agreed that Dante is not only the glory of the Muses and the popular favorite, but also the theologian lacking naught in doctrine and philosophy:

“Theologus Dantes, nullius dogmatis expers,
Quod faveat claro philosophia sinu;
Gloria Musarum, vulgo gratissimus auctor,
Hic jacet, et fama pulsat utrumque polum. . . .”

² Vidi 'l Maestro di color che sanno,
Seder tra filosofica famiglia.
Tutti l'ammiran, tutti honor gli fanno,
Quivi vid 'io e Socrate e Platone,
Che 'nnanzi agli altri piu presso gli stanno.

Inferno, iv., 131-135.

body, eternity more than time ; that the practice of virtue is noble and self-indulgence base ; that spending and being spent for the good of one's neighbor was laying up treasures in heaven ; that to live in Christ and die for Christ was gain ; that the love of God and man was the supreme law of life ; such were the seeds of doctrine sown broadcast throughout the Roman State, and nurtured by the blood of millions of martyrs. The barbarian came and conquered pagan Rome, to be conquered in turn by the Christianity he found there. And this Christianity sought him in his native wilds and took possession of him. For centuries the fierce spirit of the barbarian struggled against the checks placed upon his untutored nature. Indeed he has never been wholly overcome. We all of us carry within our breasts the savage spirit, and it only requires the occasion to arouse its ferocity.

Still, in the age of Dante, in spite of great excesses, man had come to recognize the existence of a spiritual life and a spiritual world, and to bow in submission to an authority speaking to him in the name of the higher spiritual power. He had come to regard the Church as the medium through which God reveals His will to men. And so, at this epoch, we find the secular and religious elements of society more harmoniously blended than they were before or have been since. This blending is strikingly reflected in that one great poem that is the full and clear expression of all Mediæval thought and Mediæval life.¹ Herein enters an element that is absent from pagan literature. It is the element of spiritual life and spiritual thought. It speaks of the predominance of Faith Faith tinged word and work and made both word and work sincere, earnest, and, says Ruskin, "in a degree few of us can now conceive, joyful."² Men lived in hope, sought the light and looked toward the light. Everywhere they found reflections of the Light that enlighteneth this world. In this respect there is a marked contrast between the Time-spirit of that day and the Time-spirit of the present. The great chorus of modern thought is a loud proclaiming of pessimism and the despair that would destroy a hereafter, annihilate the soul and ignore a Personal Divinity. It acts in open defiance of the whole Christian codes of spiritual truth

¹ That there was in Dante's spirit a leaven of the old Roman spirit determining his judgments of things in antagonism with the spirit of Christianity, is apparent from these two instances : 1. He condemns Pope Celestine V. for resigning from the Papacy. Now it is certainly a meritorious act to withdraw from any position the duties of which one is unable to fulfil ; and that the Church so regarded this act of Celestine is evident from the fact that she canonized the good Pope. 2. The Church condemns suicide as an act of moral cowardice ; and yet Dante places the keeping of Purgatory in the care of Cato of Utica, because he renounced life rather than liberty. It is to the point as an allegory, but the spirit of pagan Rome all unconsciously breathes through the admiration of the poet for the old Roman.

² Pleasures of England, p. 57.

and spiritual law that are essential elements in all modern conduct and modern thinking, and that lurk in the very conceptions and arguments of those who would be rid of them. "Its crowning dogma," says a recent writer, "is written even now between the lines in many a dainty volume, that evil has a secret holiness, and sin a consecrating magnificence."¹

Now, of this spirit must we divest ourselves in entering upon a study of Dante's masterpiece. There we will find no doubt. All is intense earnestness. The light of Faith guides the poet's steps through the hopeless chambers of Hell with a firmness of conviction that knows no wavering ; it bears him through the sufferings of Purgatory, believing strongly in its reality ; it raises him on the wings of love and contemplation into Heaven's empyrean, where he really hopes to enjoy bliss far beyond aught he sings. If we would understand the animating principle of the poem, it behooves us to cast aside all idea that these divisions of it were a mere barbarous and cumbersome machinery. Not in this fashion are epoch-making works constructed. Dante believed in the existence of these places and in the reality of their woes and their joys as firmly as he held his own. The simple faith pervading this poem contrasts strikingly with the spirit animating *Faust*. The latter is designed to represent the innate conflict of the savage in man against established law and order in the moral, social and physical world. Mephistopheles is the evil genius of the hero. He impersonates the negation of truth and goodness. But much as the spirit-world figures in Goethe's masterpiece, it does so not as a living reality, but as a mere scaffolding whereby Goethe builds up the artistic structure of the experiences gathered from study and observation, or found in the recesses of his own large worldly heart. And what is the uppermost lesson that one may read on every page of that wonderful panorama of modern life ? As we understand it we read simply the dark lesson, that only through the experiences that come of all manner of self-indulgence and self-gratification may one reach the broader view of life and attain perfection. This is making one's own way out of the wood of error and wrong-doing at the risk of being devoured by the beasts of predominant sin and passion. The hero is guilty of crime the most atrocious ; he brings ruin in his wake ; up to his last hour he is sensual and covetous ; he deserts not his sins ; rather his sins desert him. There are regrets ; in one instance there is remorse ; but there is no conversion. And yet, as though in mockery of the Christian ideal of personal purity and holiness, this sinful soul is triumphantly borne to heaven amid the song of Angels. He is saved by the only saving princi-

¹ Rev. William Barry, in *The Fortnightly Review*, March, 1886, Article, "The Church and the World."

ple on, or above, or under the earth—the principle of Love: "Whoever striving exerts himself, him can we redeem, and if he also participates in the love from on high, the Blessed Host will meet him with heartiest welcome."¹ Here as in Dante the hero is the special object of womanly love. She whose heart he broke pleads in his behalf before the Mater Gloriosa, and her prayer is heard. But surely the perfection of heaven is not the satiety of self-gratification. The will must be turned towards the good. It has been truly said "that not until the Ethiopian changes his skin and the leopard his spots, can he do good that is accustomed to do evil."² And this has been still more forcibly emphasized by St. Paul: "And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it availeth nothing."³ Now, where in the heart of Faust is that charity that St. Paul insists upon? What charity did he extend toward his neighbor except in so far as it gratified himself and was in accordance with his conception of things? He seeks regeneration, not in repentance, but in oblivion and communion with Nature. *Faust* is a poem of selfishness. Beatrice, after upbraiding Dante for his sins, says: "God's high destiny would be broken if Lethe were passed and such food were tasted without the repentance that breaks forth in tears."⁴ Such is the womanly love in Dante's conception: spiritual, elevating, ennobling, strengthening, ideal. These characteristics we fail to see in Goethe's conception. But *Faust* is the world-poem of this century, even as the *Divina Commedia* is of the thirteenth. Goethe is the mouthpiece of the modern world; the Middle Ages sing through Dante. And as each was a child of his age, the personality of each is a determining element written into the fibre of both great poems.

IV.

Dante, as revealed to us by time and his writings, stands out in bold relief as a man proud, fiery, irascible, the bitterness of exile and poverty corroding his soul and dropping gall from his pen, and withal humble and gentle and tender;⁵ a man strong to hate and strong to love—

Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
The love of love—

¹ *Faust*, Part II., Act V. Chorus of Angels bearing the soul of Faust.

² A Study of Dante. Susan Blow, p. 39.

³ I. Corinthians, chap. xiii., 3.

⁴ Purgatorio, xxx., 142-145.

⁵ Witness the tenderness with which the poet always speaks of the relations of mother and child (Inferno, xxiii., 38-42).

a man sincere in all he says and does, truth-loving and truth-telling, sparing no one, neither himself nor his friends, nor his enemies. His was a varied career. He imbibed at his mother's breast the traditionary feuds and traditionary hates of his family; he nurtured them and fought for them. He was acquainted with the ease and comfort of wealth; he tasted the pleasure of having had honors thrust upon him; he was wise in council and prudent in diplomacy; he felt the shock of battle and witnessed the carnage of war. He travelled from land to land studying men and things, his keen eye penetrating beneath the surface, finding naught too small to be unworthy of note, naught too grand for his expansive intellect to compass. He strayed from the paths of virtue and drank the cup of vice to its nauseous dregs,¹ and in his own soul he experienced the hell of remorse. He repented, gave himself to prayer and meditation, and even in all probability to the austerities of religious life;² he relapsed, recovered himself again,³ and died an edifying death, clad in the habit of St. Francis.⁴ He was exiled; he wandered from place to place, an outcast upon the earth, tasting the insipidity of another's salt and the weariness of going up and down another's stairs;⁵ yearning to return to his beloved Florence, which he loved with all the love of a son for a mother; always yearning, but never returning, and hating his enemies all the more fiercely for keeping him out. How insatiable was his thirst for knowledge through all his troubles we have already seen. There was no subject taught that he did not master: medicine, law, letters, music, mathematics, painting, physics, philosophy, and with great breadth and depth, his favorite, theology. He absorbed in all of these whatever was worth knowing. In some subjects he even went beyond his teachers and anticipated modern theories.⁶

Such is the man as we see him walk among men: silent, reserved, haughty, taking no liberties and allowing none to be taken. Can Grande wonder why the poet with all his learning cannot amuse half as well as his buffoon. And Dante retorts with all the scorn of his soul that he supposes it to be because like is pleased with like.⁷ Not after this fashion does he seek amusement.

¹ Purgatorio, xxx., xxxi. Paradiso, xv., 121-123. Par., xxiii., 121-123.

² Balbo, Vita. Lib. I., Cap. vii., pp. 94-98. The poet's familiarity with spiritual life could not have been well acquired outside of a noviciate.

³ Paradiso, xxii., 107-108.

⁴ Balbo, Vita. Lib. II., Cap. xvi., p. 422. Pelli, p. 144.

⁵ Paradiso, xvii., 55-66.

⁶ Il notar solamenti i luoghi degli scritti danteschi, e segnatamente del poema, in cui l'autore fa prova di singolar virtù filosofica e anticipa talvolta i pensieri e i trovati più recenti, vorrebbe un lungo discorso. Chi crederebbe, per esempio, che Dante abbia divinato il sistema dinamico? Gioberti. Del Bello, Cap. x., p. 238. See Opere. Ed. Lombardi vol. v. p. 89. See also Tiraboschi. Vita. in Opere., vol. v.

⁷ Similis simili gaudet. Hettinger, Die Göttliche Komödie, p. 55.

Not every man is a companion for him; and so we find him restless and wandering, writing his soul into his great poem.¹ That is a characteristic picture left of him by the prior of a monastery which he visited: "Dante has been here," writes Brother Hilary; "as neither I nor any of the Brothers recognized him, I asked him what he wished. He made no answer, but gazed silently upon the columns and galleries of the cloister. Again I asked him what he wished and whom he sought; and slowly turning his head, and looking around upon the Brothers and me, he answered, 'Peace!'"² Brother Hilary takes him apart and speaks a kind word to him, and the reticence and reserve melt away, and beneath the haughty crust, hardened by adversity, is found the gentleness of woman. The kind word and the kind treatment draw from his bosom the precious fragment of his great poem lying there, and he hands it to the prior with the words, "Here, Brother, is a portion of my work which you may not have seen; this remembrance I leave with you; forget me not."³

In this manner do we catch glimpses of the circumstances under which the great poem was written. The author suffered much; but his sufferings purified his soul and raised him out of the transitory into the sphere of the permanent and the ideal. They were his purgatorial fire. Nor should we judge him rashly. We should be lenient towards the gall his pen has dropped, for it has been distilled in his soul by the exile, poverty, persecution and degradation to which he was subjected. "If," says one who reveres him, "from the dearest illusions of youth, wrapped in the halo of a benevolent imagination, the wickedness of men has thrown you out of the circle of your activity, your affection, your early hopes and aspirations, into the midst of cruel deceptions; if you have been deeply sensitive like Dante, and like Dante have suffered the persecutions of an age that never pardons one raising himself above it; then, and then only have you the right to condemn his explosions of wrath."⁴

V.

But if the *Divina Commedia* contained only the ventings of private spleen—if it were simply the effect of a mind seeking self-glorification; or were it merely an esoteric expression of some unor-

¹ Mais ce qu'il raconte, c'est sa propre conversion. Edmond Scherer, *Litt. contempor.*, p. 60.

² It is the same peace the poet sought from world to world:

—"quella pace,
Che dietro a' piedi di sì fatta guida,
Di mondo in mondo cercar mi si face." *Purgatorio*, V., 61-63.

³ Balbo, *Vita.*, p. 290; *Cantù. Histoire des Italiens*, t.v., p. 484.

⁴ *Cæsar Cantù*, l.c., p. 516.

thodox clique¹—it would not live as it has lived, nor would it deserve to rank among the great world-poems. These outbursts are the least portions of it. The poet's soul was too great to be tied down by any party or a slave to any transitory bond. Raised a Guelf,² circumstances and his convictions throw him into the Ghibelline party, but he finds words of rebuke for both Guelf and Ghibelline. Both have run into extremes; he knows not which to censure most;³ so, raising himself above both, he finds the path of honor in making a party for himself.⁴ In like manner did he burst the bonds of passion that held him to earth. And so he walks through exile and suffering, his soul dwelling apart from and far above the fleeting and transitory; reading in all things the ideal beyond sign and symbol; treading this earth as though it were a mere shell whose mysterious murmurings bring him tidings of the sea of eternity and infinitude far beyond; bearing in his heart a love pure and bright and elevating, that raises him up when he has fallen and bears him triumphantly through trial and temptation. At a tender age—in his ninth year⁵—when the bloom of innocence is still upon his youth, a glance at a child, younger than himself by some months, awakens in him consciousness and enkindles in him a spark of love sweet and pure and ideal; and the spark grows into a flame, and the flame burns clear and steady, a beacon directing his whole career. He has risen to a New Life. The child grows to womanhood, marries another and dies young, all unconscious of the love that consumes her poet-lover. And the poet-lover also marries other than his first love, and has children born to him, and grows in greatness and influence, and becomes a leader of men in his beloved Florence, one to be relied on by his friends and feared by his enemies. Still the passion of his boyhood becomes the cherished ideal of his bosom. He goes astray, but the thought of the loved one reclaims him; another demands his care and attention, but he communes with this one in his dreams and has visions of her in glory. He sings of her in his waking hours. Her image is the talisman whereby to banish all unworthy thoughts and desires. He extols her; he idealizes her; he embalms her forever in his immortal poem. He identifies her with, and makes her the impersonation of, his favorite study, Theology; and henceforth the name

¹ Such were the opinions of Ugo Foscolo, Rossetti, Aroux. See Cæsar Cantù's reply to Aroux in *Histoire des Italiens*, t. vii., p. 531.

² Balbo, *Vita*, p. 229.

³ L'uno al pubblico segno i gigli giallo,
Oppone, e l'altro appropria quello a parte,
Si ch'è forte a veder qual più si falli.—Paradiso, vi., 100–102.

⁴ Di sua bestialitate il suo processo,
Farà la pruova, si ch'a te fia bello,
Averti fatta parte per te stesso.—*Ibid.*, xvii., 67–69.

⁵ *Vita Nuova*, ii.

of Beatrice shall stand before men as the synonym of whatever is inspiring in love and ennobling in womanhood. The passion of boyhood followed her to the heavenly abode in which he fancied her, and waxed with years into a most ideal and spiritual influence until it finally ripened in the poet's heart through long and laborious study, into the fulfilment of his early promise "to say of her what was never said of any woman."¹ This spiritualized type of womanhood stands out unique in the whole range of literature. It is Dante's own creation; rather it is the creation of the Christianity that reveres and honors the Virgin Mother. Love was the actuating principle of the poet's life. Not love of woman only, but love of country, love of study, love of religion; and not simply love, but love enlightened and strengthened by a Faith that pierces the veil of the visible and transient and beholds the regions of the spiritual and eternal.²

Dante's love for the religion of his birth grew in him into a passion. Neither the Guelf hatred of his youth, nor the Ghibelline hatred of his later years, against the persons of several Popes, ever for a moment obscured his mind to the truth of the doctrines of the Church or the sacred office of the Papacy. In his view, the greatness of ancient Rome was decreed solely to render it worthy of being the Holy Place in which should sit the successors of the great Fisherman.³ The mystical vine of the Church still grows, and Peter and Paul who died for it still live.⁴ He holds by that Church; he begs Christians not to be moved, featherlike, "by every wind of doctrine." "You have," he tells them, "the Old Testament and the New, and the Pastor of the Church who guides you; let this suffice for your salvation."⁵ With this profound respect for the Church, he loved her ceremonies, her dogma, her teachings, her institutions. He to whom the heavens and all that they contain were symbols of the spiritual essences they veil, could not fail to grasp the poetry and the meaning of every prayer and ceremony and office of that Church who, through whatever is in and about her temples, speaks eloquently to men in sign and symbol. There is not a stone in her cathedrals that has not its mystical meaning; there is not a garment with which her priest vests himself that is

¹ Vita Nuova, xliii.

² See N. Tommaseo *L'Inferno*, Int. p. xlvii.

³ La quale, e 'l quale, a voler dir lo vero,
Fur stabiliti per lo loco santo,
U' siede il successor del maggior Piero.—*Inferno*, ii., 22-24.

⁴ Pensa che Pietro e Paolo, che moriro
Per la vigna che guasti, *ancor son vivi*.—*Paradiso*, xviii., 131-132.

⁵ Avete 'l vecchio e 'l nuovo Testamento,
E'l Pastor della Chiesa che vi guida:
Questo vi basti a vostro salvamento.—*Paradiso*, v., 76-78.

not emblematic of some spiritual truth ; there is not an anthem or antiphon in her offices that does not help to draw out the beauty and significancy back of it all. "The elements and fragments of poetry," says the Dean of St. Paul's, in his charming monograph, "were everywhere in the Church—in her ideas of life, in her rules and institutions for passing through it, in her preparation for death, in her offices, ceremonial, celebrations, usages, her consecration of domestic, literary, commercial, civic, military, political life, the meanings and ends she had given them, the religious seriousness with which the forms of each were dignified—in her doctrine and her dogmatic system—her dependence on the unseen world—her Bible. From each and all of these, and from that public feeling, which, if it expressed itself but abruptly and incoherently, was quite alive to the poetry which surrounded it, the poet received an impression of greatness and beauty, of joy and dread."¹ How far the poet made use of the impulses emanating from one and all of these influencing agencies is known only to him who has made a complete and thorough study of the great poem embodying their inspirations. For we must not lose sight of the fact that the poem is, in all the grandeur and depth of its mystical meaning, made up of the spirit and doctrine of the Church.² The spites and personal animosities are but specks scattered here and there upon the whole surface of crystalline beauty. Shining out in pristine splendor is the Spiritual Sense. Let us now glance at the philosophy and doctrine underlying that Sense.

VI.

There is a common ground on which meet all supreme intelligences. It is the region of the Ideal. It is ascended only by the long and arduous labor of study and thought. There meet poetry and philosophy in their highest soarings. They meet and converse and stand upon the footing of mutual understanding. Poetry is permeated by the philosophic spirit, and philosophy dons the garb of poetry. Few are the souls assembled upon that supreme height. Plato and Virgil dwell there ; so do Shakespeare and Goethe. And, consummate singer, profound philosopher and skilled theologian, by every right and title, as being each and all of these, there also is the home of Dante. Sweetest of singers, he is at the same time profoundly scientific ; his mental vision sees the nicest intricacies and the most delicate distinctions ; eminently religious, he also gathers up the fragments of ancient mythologies and ancient systems that he finds stranded upon his age, and pieces them to-

¹ Rev. R. W. Church, *Dante*, p. 111.

² "Dante cristiano, cristianissimo sempre nel Poema e in tutte le opere ; Dante Cattolico sempre. . . ."—Balbo Vita, *Lib.*, ii. Cap. ii., p. 232.

gether, giving them deeper import in the light of the Christian mysticism in which he is immersed. "He brought back," says Gioberti, "the Gentile mythology and symbolism to their source, rendering them anew esoteric and poetic."¹ He made them wholly subordinate to the Christian spirit, and by means of them conveyed practical lessons that are balm to the weary and drink to the thirsty. In like manner did he treat the science of his day. He made it the handmaid of the great spiritual truths he would impart. For this reason it is of small moment whether his theories be superseded by others apparently more probable; the moral and spiritual lesson still remains, and still speaks to the same human heart and the same human aspirations. So also did he make use of allegory.

Allegory there was before the time of Dante. Vision, too, was there. Such were the visions of Alberic;² such the vision of Paul³ and many others.⁴ The language of allegory and vision was the favorite mode of conveying spiritual advice.⁵ But all previous visions and allegories are to the great allegorical vision of Dante what the old plays and stories out of which our own Shakespeare constructed his immortal masterpieces, are to those masterpieces themselves. In the one case and in the other, we may trace phrases and expressions and conceptions and even whole trains of thought to their sources; but to what avail? In the one case and in the other, the master-mind has given to the phrase or sentence a new application and a larger scope, and with grasp of purpose and sureness of aim, has reset sentence and phrase in a sense in which through all time they will be recognized as the ideal form. To achieve this is the exclusive mission of genius. And in a marked degree was this the mission of Dante. Critics find fault with his occasional coarseness of diction. True it is that Dante does not employ words with the view of concealing the image he would portray. His descriptions are always vivid. Whatever there is in his poem that is beautiful or tender—and much there is of beauty and tenderness—he expresses with delicacy and sweetness the most exquisite; but when the poet would describe the loathsome and the horrible, he makes use of language best calculated to leave a loathsome or horrible impression. Critics should not forget that elegance and prettiness of phrase are not grandeur

¹ Del Bello, Cap. x., p. 214.

² Tommaseo. L'Inferno, p. 416. Discorso: Altre visioni infernali.

³ Ozanam. Dante et la Philosophie Catholique au XIII^eme. Siècle, p. 473.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 484-491.

⁵ Ozanam calls attention to the general analogy between the passage of the soul through the spheres of the Paradiso and the favorite titles of the ascetic treatises of St. Bonaventura: *Itinerarium mentis ad Deum*; *Formula aurea de gradibus virtutem*; *De vii. itineribus aeternitatis*. In *loc. cit.*, p. 335.

and strength; that they are wholly incompatible with grandeur and strength; that if Dante were always elegant and pretty in his phrasings Dante would never have been great or sublime, nor would his poem tower through the vista of the ages one of the grandest monuments of human thought and human skill ever conceived and executed. And the secret of it all lies in the poet's intense earnestness.

This earnestness asserts itself throughout the poem chiefly in three lines of thought: 1. A devoted patriot, loving his country, suffering for it, and yearning for its welfare with all the energy of his being, he launches notes of warning and denunciation against its vices, its enemies, and its false friends, and with invective the most scathing vilifies all who seemingly stand between it and its well-being. This burning patriotism has made the poem the great national epic.¹ 2. A child of the Church, true and attached, though at times wayward, the poet takes the liberty of a child free-spoken and free to speak, to utter words of censure against what he considers abuses in the external administration of the Church and the policy of her Pontiffs.² 3. Finally, Dante's chief mission, the prime motive of his intense earnestness, is the Spiritual Sense underlying his poem. This he has not left to be discovered. He takes the pains to inform the reader. He tells him that leaving aside all subtle investigation, the end and aim of his poem briefly put, both as regards the whole and its parts, is to remove therefrom men living in a state of misery in this life, and lead them to one of happiness.³ This he does upon an ethical basis.

The poet recognizes free-will as the basis of all human responsibility, and the consequent amenability of the soul to reward or punishment: "*Inborn in you is the virtue that keepeth counsel and that should guard the threshold of assent. Here is the principle whereto occasion of meriting in you is attached, according as it gathers up and winnows out good or guilty loves.*"⁴ The argument of his poem is man receiving at the hands of Divine Justice his deserts according to the nature of the actions he performs.⁵ Man passes from the darkness of sin and the wilderness of error into the light of truth and grace. The poem is a song of emancipation. It chants the break-

¹ L'Inferno, xxvi., 1-10; Purgatorio, vi., 75-151; Paradiso, xv., xvi. To understand the political aspect of the poem it is essential to read the author's work *De Monarchia* and some available history of that period, say Villani or Cæsar Cantù.

² Inferno, xix., 88-117; Paradiso, xviii., 115-136; xxvii., 19-66.

³ Sed ommissa subtili investigatione, dicendum est breviter, quod finis totius et partis est, removere viventes in hac vita de statu miseræ, et perducere ad statum felicitatis. Epistola, xi., Ep. ad Kani Grandi de la Scala, §15.

⁴ Purgatorio, xviii., 61-66. See the whole of this important passage. Cf. Summa, ii., 1, quæst., cxiv., Article 4.

⁵ Ep. xi., § 11.

ing of the bonds of sin, and the passing into the light and freedom of the children of God. It is a song of hope. Evil is indeed mighty, and great is the havoc it plays among souls; but mightier still is God's grace. It is a song of light and life. Its tendency is upward and onward to the triumph of spirit over matter. It is ever pouring into our souls to the music of

"One clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping-stones
Of their dead selves to higher things." ¹

The poem is, therefore, practical. The thought, the energy and the earnestness of the whole age are concentrated upon it. Speculation abounds in it; but it is in order that knowing all the better one may do all the better. The poet is careful to tell us that if he speaks by way of speculation, it is not for the sake of mere barren words, but rather that such may tend to action.² The intellect is made for truth; its ultimate perfection consists in the contemplation of truth.³ The poet never forgets that true wisdom consists in right-knowing and right-doing.

VII.

In the development of this thought have we the mystical meaning and central idea of the *Divina Commedia*. It is the drama of human nature sinning, struggling against vice, straining after perfection, and making for the Supreme Good by means of Knowledge and Power: the primary knowledge of one's duties towards oneself, one's neighbor and God, and the larger knowledge of the relation and coördination of those duties in the light of philosophy and theology; the power flowing from this knowledge aided by prayer and grace and the assistance of the unseen, spiritual world.

The element that gives life to the knowledge and makes effective the power, is Love. Love is the inspiration of all knowledge. Without love there can be no philosophy; ⁴ it is the form—the soul—of philosophy.⁵ Be it remembered that philosophy is not, in the intention of Dante, mere speculation. It is an intimate union

¹ Tennyson, In Memoriam, I., i.

² Ep. xi., § 16. "Non ad speculandum, sed ad opus inceptum est totum."

³ Così della induzione della perfezione seconda le scienze sono cagioni in noi; per l'abito delle quali potemo la verità speculare, ch'è ultimà perfezione nostra, siccome dice il Filosofo nel sesto del Etica, quando dice che'l vero è'l bene dello intelletto." *Convito*, ii., 14, p. 153, Ed. Fraticelli.

⁴ "A filosofare è necessario amore." *Convito*, Tratto iii., Cap. 13.

⁵ Amore è forma di filosofia, *Ibid.*

of the soul with wisdom in all-absorbing and undivided love.¹ Therefore it is that only those living according to reason can become philosophers. Those leading merely the life of the senses can know or experience naught of the mysteries and consolations of this true philosophy.² Nor can intelligences exiled from their supernal home, such as fallen angels and damned souls, philosophize, for the reason that love has become extinguished in them and malice prevails.³ Love is the soul of philosophy; wisdom is its body; morality its beauty; such is the underlying conception of Dante's doctrine.⁴ He recognizes no truth that is not a ray of the Divine Intelligence; no good that does not flow from the Infinite Love; no beauty that is not clothed in the morality born of the Eternal Law. "*The Alpha and Omega of all writing that Love reads me is the Supreme Good that contents this Court.*"⁵ So speaks he in his sublime vision to the Apostle of Love. And he enlarges upon it in this fashion: "*By argument of philosophy, and by authority descending hence, such Love must needs on me be stamped; for Good, so far as it is good and comprehended as such, enkindleth Love, and enkindleth it all the greater as more of goodness is therein comprised. Therefore, towards that Essence—so supreme that every good which is found outside of It is but a ray of Its light—more than towards aught else, it behooveth the mind of each one discerning the truth whereon is based this evidence, to move in love.*"⁶ From that Divine Essence have come all things; to the same should all things tend. And as regards man, both reason and revelation urge him to keep for God the sovereign use of all his loves.⁷

Nor does the poet stop here. With depth and force and admirable grasp of expression, he penetrates to the workings of Love in the Godhead. He determines It to be not only a principle of Light, but also a principle of Life. Here he is mystical, sublime, suggestive. He stands upon the highest plane of Christian philosophy. He contemplates the Trinity in the creative act. He beholds the Triune Godhead in the bosom of the Word. And thus the Word, which is the central fact of all history, the central thought of all philosophy, the central germ of all speech, becomes for Dante the central Idea of the *Divina Commedia*. He says: "*That which dieth not, and that which can die, are naught else than the splendor of that Idea*⁸ *which in His love our Lord begetteth. For that living Light*⁹ *—which so goeth forth from Its source*¹⁰ *that it ceases not to be*

¹ Amore è forma di filosofia. Cap. 12.

³ Convito. Tr. iii., Cap. 13.

⁵ Paradiso, xxvi., 16-18.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 45-47.

⁹ The Word, the Son.

² *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, Cap. 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 25-36.

⁸ The Word.

¹⁰ The Father.

one therewith,¹ as well as with the Love² that maketh Three-in-One—of Its bounty³ unites Its rays as though mirrored in nine subsistences,⁴ *Itself remaining eternally One and Undivided. Thence It descends to the ultimate potentialities, passing down from act to act, till It makes no further than brief contingencies*;⁵ and these contingencies I understand to be things generated, which the moving heavens⁶ produce with and without seed.”⁷ The sum and substance of this sublime doctrine is that Love produces all things, from the heaven of heavens and the celestial spirits down to the least and most evanescent creature. With St. Thomas the poet here holds the influence of the heavenly bodies as secondary causes.⁸ With the Angelic Doctor he also holds that beings are perfect in proportion as they reflect the Divine attributes:⁹ “*If burning Love disposes and stamps the clear view of the Prime Virtue, all perfection is there acquired. Thus was the earth once made worthy of all the perfection of living things; thus was the Virgin made a mother.*”¹⁰ And so, the Ideal becomes the standard of all beauty. Grand vistas of thought here open up to our contemplation; but we must not tarry. One remark, however, may be permitted. It has been well said: “See deep enough and you see musically; the heart of nature being everywhere music if you can only reach it.”¹¹ If it has ever been given to human intellect to look back of sign and symbol and behold the essence and relation of things, it has been given to Dante. And this is why he has seen so musically. He sees the harmony of virtue and justice and suffering all blended in their true relations; and the harmony fills him with wonderment, and its music enters his soul, and he sings it in accents so sweet that he who lets the sweetness enter into his heart, may well say with the poet on hearing Casella sing one of his own hymns: “*Still sounds its sweetness within me!*”¹²

¹ Ego et Pater unum sumus. Joan. X., 30.

² The Holy Ghost, the Third Divine Person.

³ *i.e.*, of Its goodness, not through necessity.

⁴ “In the nine heavens, or in the nine motive intelligences.” BIANCHI.

⁵ *i.e.*, extending down from the more active to the less active till It comes to the least existence in the chain of created things.

⁶ “Divine Light, moving the heaven produces things generated.”—TOMMASEO.

⁷ Paradiso, xiii., 53-66.

⁸ Corpora caelestia sunt causa inferiorum effectuum mediantibus causis particularibus inferioribus, quae deficere presunt in minori parte.

Virtus corporis caelestis non est infinita; unde requirit determinatam dispositionem in materia ad inducendum suum effectum et quantum ad distantiam loci, et quantum ad alias condiciones. Summa, I., quæst. cxv., Article vi., ad. 1 & 2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, ii., I. Quæst. iv., Article 5.

¹⁰ Paradiso, xiii., 79-84.

¹¹ Carlyle. Heroes and Hero-Worship, Lect., iii.

¹² Che la dolcezza ancor dentro mi suona. Purgatorio, ii., 114.

VIII.

That deep insight into the moral and physical world has enabled Dante to see in Love not only the Light and the Life of all things created—and even of the Uncreated One in Whom Love, Light, and Life are one infinite identical activity—but also the principle and source of sin and passion: “*Neither Creator nor a creature was ever without Love, be it natural or be it spiritual; and well thou knowest. The natural is always free from error; but err the other may by evil objects, or by excess, or by defect of vigor. Whilst well-directed in the first, and in the second it moderates itself, it cannot be cause of evil delight; but when to ill it turns aside, or when with more care than it ought, or with less, it runs after good, then against the Creator works His own creation. Hence it behooves you to understand how Love should be in you the seed of every virtue as well as of every deed deserving punishment.*”¹ And so the poet continues, holding with the Angelic Doctor that there is no passion—not even excepting Hate—that does not presuppose Love.² For, as the great Schoolman teaches, there is no passion that is not moved towards, or does not rest in, some object. And it is so because of some kind of harmony or adaptability between the subject moved or resting and the object towards which it moves or in which it rests. But Love consists in the accord of the one loving with the object loved.³ Now the human heart seeks the good, yearns for the good, loves the good, and is content only in the possession and enjoyment of the good. This is a primary law. No system of philosophy has ever soared higher than that question every Christian child learns from the Little Catechism: “Why did God make you? God made me to know Him, to love Him, and serve Him in this world, and to be happy with him forever in the next.”⁴ It contains the solution of the whole mystery of man. It names the Supreme Good towards which tends all Love.

But it frequently happens that the Supreme Good becomes clouded from man's vision and intent, and he seeks bliss in loving the lesser goods that are more palpable to his view. Herein is how Love becomes the source of all that is sinful in thought and word and work on the part of man. 1. Now it is Love excessive. As such it seeks happiness in imaginary perfection, or the praise of men, or a sense of self-sufficiency that causes one to ignore one's origin, or helplessness, or dependency upon the aid of Grace. This is Pride or Vanity. Again, this worldly love impels one to seek happiness solely in the external sufficiency that wealth can bring.

¹ Purgatorio, xvii., 91-105.

² Summa I. ii., Quæst. xxvii., Art. 4.

³ Summa. I. ii., Quæst. xxix, Art. 2.

⁴ A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, Lesson I., On the End of Man.

This is Avarice; and it is at the root of treasons, frauds, deceits, prejudices, anxieties, violence, and insensibility to misery.¹ The same Love seeks bodily gratification either in eating or drinking to excess—and this is Gluttony; or in the enjoyment of the carnal and sexual appetites—and this is Lust. 2. Now it is Love defective. As such, it is lax and sad in attending to things spiritual, and is known as Sloth. 3. Finally, it is Love distorted. As such, it grudgingly looks upon a neighbor's prosperity as an obstacle in the way of one's preëminence—when it is called Envy; or it changes into wrathful feelings that seek to be revenged for real or fancied wrong. It is then called Anger. These various forms of misapplied Love are known as the Seven Capital Sins, and are the chief sources of all evil.²

The poet takes these sins and all the sins that flow from them, and holds them up to our view in all their loathsome nakedness. And he does so, not as a mere matter of sport, but that he and his readers may learn to hate them, and from witnessing their torments may get some faint conception of their enormity, and may be led to exclaim: "*Wisdom Supreme, how great is the art Thou showest in heaven, on earth, and in the evil world, and how well Thy Goodness dispenseth justice!*"³ The poet transports us to the Hell that he so vividly pictures; we there are told the dire consequences of sin to persons and families and peoples upon earth; we meditate upon the dread lessons embodied in this song of woe and wrath, of wailings and regrets, and our soul learns to recoil from aught that could break the golden chain of Law and Love with which the Creator binds all His creatures to Himself. It is a solemn preparation for the more practical lessons conveyed in the other two parts of the poem. Their Spiritual Sense at once becomes apparent. Indeed, it is the clue to their proper appreciation. For the great poem gives us, as no other purely human production gives us, "the solution of the great, eternal, and sole problem of our life, namely, deliverance from evil and final bliss in God as the source of all Truth and all Love."⁴ Let us, in a cursory manner, follow the evolution of that Spiritual Sense.

IX.

The poet is in the midway of life.⁵ He has become entangled in the woods of sin and error. He is beset by three predominant

¹ Summa. II. ii., Quæst. cxviii., Art. 8.

² Summa. I. ii., Quæst. lxxxiv., Art. 4. See Inferno, xi. and Tommaseo's tract appended to this Canto, entitled *Dottrina Penale di Dante*, p. 120. The poet gives the genesis of the Seven Capital Sins on the same line of reasoning with St. Thomas, whom we have here followed in substance. See Purgatorio, xvii., 106-139.

³ Inferno, xix., 10-12.

⁴ Hettinger, *Die Göttliche Komödie*, p. 56.

⁵ Inferno, I., i.

passions that are about to devour him. These are the lion of pride and over-vaulting ambition, the leopard of concupiscence, and the she-wolf of avarice. Mary, Mother of Divine Grace, sees his plight, and forasmuch as he has venerated her, she does not abandon him in his peril. She sends Lucy, or Illuminative Grace, to his assistance. Lucy commands Virgil—that is, Reason—enlightened by her directions, to save him. As he is about returning upon his evil course,¹ reason tells him that he must take another road if he would escape the beasts and be rid of the errors of his ways.² He obeys. The journey is long and dismal and dreary. Sometimes the poet is discouraged and desires to return.³ Sometimes he requires, in an especial manner, the assistance of Virgil; as when the Roman poet turns him around and with his own hands closes his eyes that he may not behold the Gorgon; and all of which means that there are certain sins and temptations in life that cannot be overcome by human nature unaided by reason and God's redeeming grace. Such is sensuality, which hardens the heart, even as the head of the Gorgon was fabled to turn to stone those looking thereon. In giving the figure the poet would have us look to the spiritual sense: "*O you who have sane intellects, note the doctrine veiled beneath those strange verses.*"⁴ At times Virgil himself is unable to make headway against the powers of darkness. But a heavenly messenger comes and dispels all dread, and opens the entrance, and forthwith Dante and his guide walk securely and without molestation.⁵ They find no further opposition. Indeed it is only by reason of heavenly grace that Virgil is able to lead Dante through the dread regions: "From on high descends virtue, which enables me to lead him."⁶ Whereby the poet would teach that human reason, good and admirable as it may be in itself, is not sufficient to contend against the world of passion and the evil spirits that inspire wrong-doing. Again, at times the poet would rest. But there is no resting-place for the soul struggling with evil till it frees itself therefrom. And so we have the grand lesson of work and energy in overcoming indolence and sloth and evil habit: "*It now behooveth thee to shake off all slothfulness, said the Master, for fame comes not to him who sits on down or lies abed; without which whoso consumes his life, leaves on earth such trace of himself as smoke in air or foam on water. Arise, therefore! Conquer thy panting with the soul that conquers every battle, so be it that it sinks*

¹ Ibid. xv., 50-52.

² E non c'era altra via che questa per la quale io mi son messo. Purgatorio, i., 62-63.

³ Inferno, viii., 100-103.

⁴ Ibid. ix., 50-63.

⁵ Inferno, ix., 100-105.

⁶ Purgatorio, I., 68-69.

*not down with its heavy body."*¹ And we have the further lesson that mere sorrow of the lips and outward observance of the law, or reception of the Sacraments, will avail little unless accompanied by change of heart and sincere detestation of sin: "He cannot be absolved who doth not first repent; nor can he repent the sin and will it at the same time, for this were contradiction to which reason cannot consent."² Thus, in picturing sin and its punishment, in such colors as human conception has never approached, the poet is teaching us the lesson of struggle with self, of abhorrence of wrong-doing, and of making effort towards personal holiness.

This is especially the great lesson of the *Purgatorio*. Before entering these realms of hope and sweet contentment amid great suffering—hope and contentment because accompanied by Love—the poet must first be washed of the grime and filth that have clung to him in the evil world, the contemplation of which so saddened his eyes and weighed down his heart. He is, furthermore, to be girt with a lowly and pliant rush; "*Go then,*" says Cato, "*and gird this man with a smooth rush; then wash his face so that therefrom thou mayst put away all filthiness; for it were unseemly, with eye obscured by any cloud, to go before the first Minister who is of them of Paradise.*"³ In which words is conveyed the wholesome lesson that after one has been cleansed from the grime of sin, one must gird on the plain rush of humility; for as pride is the chief of all capital sins, so is humility the foundation of all virtue; and with meek and lowly heart must one walk in the narrow way, fearing lest one fall and remembering that one carries heavenly treasures in a frail vessel. And once the soul has set out upon the road of virtue and right-doing, she must not go back: "*Let not your returning be hitherward. The Sun which is now rising will show you where to take the mountain at an easier ascent.*"⁴ In proportion as the soul becomes enlightened by prayer and meditation will she find all the easier the ascent up the mountain-heights of perfection.

It is only through humble obedience in all right-doing and humble submission in all right-thinking that the soul can attain the great object of this pilgrimage. This is the only road to liberty. And liberty of spirit is what the poet seeks: "He goeth in search of liberty, which is so dear, as he knoweth who for it gave up his life."⁵ He goes in search of the highest spiritual good. And he can only advance in the light: "*To go upward in the night*

¹ Inferno, xxiv., 46-54. Cf. Wisdom, ix., 15.

² Inferno, xxvii., 118-120.

³ Purgatorio, I., 94-99.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 106-108.

⁵ Purgatorio, I., 71-72. Cato taking his own life rather than renounce liberty, is symbolical of the soul, destroying all selfishness that it may attain the light and freedom of spiritual life. See Bianchi's Ed. Div. Com., note to those lines p. 245, Ed. 1863; p. 253, Ed. 1868.

may not be.”¹ Only by grace and mercy can one progress in the path of perfection. Still freedom of will is respected, and so the poet may retrace his steps in the darkness: “*Well might one there-with turn downward and wander about the hillside whilst that the horizon holds the day closed.*”² The poet arrives at the gate of purification. It is guarded by an angel whose face is radiant with beauty and who bears a sword and keys. There are three steps. The first is of white marble so polished that therein the poet may see himself mirrored. The second is a fire-burnt rock tinted more deeply than perse,³ with a cross through its length and breadth. The third is porphyry flaming as blood spirting forth from a vein.⁴ The poet begs for mercy, striking his breast, and asks to enter. Here, indeed, the allegorical veil is so thin that whoso chooses may penetrate it in the light of Catholic doctrine and Catholic practice. “We need hardly be told,” says one who has written a charming book instinct with beautiful thoughts and suggestions, “that the gate of St. Peter is the Tribunal of Penance. . . . The triple stair stands revealed as candid Confession mirroring the whole man, mournful Contrition breaking the hard heart of the gazer on the Cross, Love all aflame offering up in satisfaction the life-blood of body, soul and spirit:—the adamantine threshold-seat as the priceless merits of Christ the Door, Christ the Rock, Christ the sure Foundation and the precious Corner-Stone. In the Angel of the Gate, as in the Gospel Angel of Bethesda, is discerned the Confessor; in the dazzling radiance of his countenance the exceeding glory of the ministration of righteousness; in the penitential robe the sympathetic meekness whereby restoring one overtaken in a fault, he considers himself lest he also be tempted; in the sword the wholesome severity of his discipline; in the golden key his divine authority; in the silver, the discernment of spirits whereby he denies absolution to the impenitent, the learning and discretion whereby he directs the penitent.”⁵

And now, repentant and with good resolve, the soul goes forth on its final pilgrimage of purification. There is still upon it the impress of the Seven Capital Sins. To rid itself of the last trace of these is its first endeavor. And as the angel brushes away the trace of one sin after the other,⁶ and the soul advances farther and farther in the way of perfection, it finds itself growing all the lighter for having gotten rid of the burden of its imperfections, and

¹ Purgatorio, vii., 44.

² *Ibid.*, 58–60.

³ “Perse is a mixture of purple and black, the black predominating.”—Dante. *Convito*, iv., 20.

⁴ Purgatorio, ix., 90–102.

⁵ Maria F. Rossetti, *A Shadow of Dante*, pp. 112, 113. See the Dissertation of Tommaseo to Purgatorio, ix., *Penitenza Correzione*.

⁶ Purgatorio, xii., 140 *sqq.*

the more eager is it to mount to the summit.¹ Charity takes possession of the soul and she would see all men ascend with her: "*O, race of men,*" admonishes the poet, "*born to fly upwards, why at a little wind fall ye so down?*"² He also upbraids us for allowing ourselves to remain blind to the beauty and splendor of things spiritual, and becoming absorbed in things earthly: "*Heaven calls you, and revolves around you, showing you its eternal beauties; and your eye gazes only on the earth, wherefore He who discerns all chastises you.*"³ We here perceive too that in affliction and trouble the soul has come to recognize the Hand that punishes: "*He who discerns all chastises you;*" and she accepts her trials as coming from the hand of a loving Father, and offers them up in expiation for past sin and as a source of meriting.

Finally, the poet passes through the fire that cleanses him whole, and Virgil says to him: *The temporal fire and the eternal hast thou seen, my son, and thou art come to a part where of myself no farther do I discern. With reason and with art have I brought thee hither. Take for guide thine own good pleasure; beyond the steep ways and the narrow art thou. Yonder is the sun that shines upon thy forehead; here are the young grass, the flowers and the shrubs, which the land of itself alone brings forth. Whilst rejoicing come the fair eyes that with their weeping made me go to thy aid, thou mayst sit down and mayst go among them. Await no more word nor sign from me; free and upright and sound is thy Free-will, and it were wrong not to do its bidding; wherefore thee over thyself I crown and mitre.*"⁴ The soul has conquered. Therefore Virgil leaves the poet free from the dominion of his passions; more than free, a king crowned triumphant over himself; more than king, a mitred priest, ruling the cloister of his heart, his thoughts and his affections, and mediator and intercessor before the Divine Mercy for himself and those commending themselves to his prayers. Through speculation and through right-doing has he been led by reason as far as reason can lead him. He now passes into the hands of Divine Theology and Grace Illuminant, and in the radiance beaming from her eyes and dispelling many a mist of ignorance, he will read profitable lessons of wisdom and of spiritual perfection. He meets Beatrice. Henceforth neither fear of eternal torments, nor hope of mere earthly reward, nor consolations of sense and feeling will be his incentive to right-doing. Love alone will lead him. In the company of Beatrice, basking in her sweet smile and receiving her loving admonitions, will he walk from sphere to sphere and traverse the

¹ —Pungémi la fretta

Per la impacciata via.—Purgatorio, xxi., 4-5.

² Purgatorio, xii., 95-96.

³ *Ibid.*, xiv., 149-151.

⁴ Purgatorio, xxvii., 127-143.

Empyrean. She begins by showing him how great is the distance between the mere science of reason and speculation and the high and holy Light that will now be a guide to his feet. The poet asks: "*But why so far above my sight flies thy wished-for speech, that the more my vision strains to see it the more it loses it?*" And Beatrice answers: "*To the end that thou mayst know the School that thou hast followed; mayst see how its doctrines can keep pace with my speech; mayst also see that your way is from the Divine way as far apart as from earth in distance speeds the highest heaven.*"¹ Henceforth the soul will tread God's way. And in what consists that way?

It is a way not unknown to every soul seeking after spiritual perfection and union with God. It is the way of personal purity and holiness. It hath been well and beautifully said: "The only obstacle to spiritual growth lies in ourselves. Goodness Divine, which 'spurns from Itself all envy,' is forever shining in ideal beauty and drawing the soul with cords of love. If we do not see the heavenly vision, it is because we are blinded by sin; if we do not press forward towards it, it is because we are clogged by sin."² But the whole mission of the Church—that to achieve which she makes use of all the means at her command—is to enable the soul to divest herself of sin and become united with the Supreme Good. In the Church flows the spirit of regeneration. She is the mystical vine perennially shooting forth branch and leaf and luscious fruit throughout the ages, and in every fibre retaining vigor and freshness. Her mystical sap continues to nourish souls and impart to them a healthful and health-giving growth and development. And that mystical sap is none other than Love Divine. It glows in the heart of every member grafted on her mystical body. It inspires the spirit of charity and fosters the communion of saints. Now it is in this spirit that Dante wrote his great poem, and in this spirit must that poem be read. It is the story of a soul seeking perfection in unison and harmony with the Church, by the light of Faith and borne upward by the supreme law of Love.

Now, indeed the scales of selfishness, and worldly wisdom, and earthly motives and measures fall from the poet's eyes and he sees things as they are in the light of God's presence. The beauty of virtue and personal holiness, the nobility and dignity of obedience, the exalted grandeur of humility, the great excellence of poverty and the numberless blessings accompanying it; the necessity of being detached from things of earth; the intrinsic worth of riches, honors and pleasures; the wonders of the Incarnation and Redemption and the exhaustless oceans of grace flowing

¹ Purgatorio, xxxiii., 82-90. Cf. De Imitatione Christi, Lib., iii., Cap., 31, 32.

² A Study of Dante, Susan Blow, p. 65.

therefrom; all these subjects, and many more as well, are dwelt upon directly or impliedly, amid the music of the spheres and the Hosannas of angels and saints—catching up and re-echoing in heaven the hymns and offices sung by the saints on earth—with a wealth and gorgeousness of expression, and a sustained music, borrowed from the heavenly music that had entered the author's heart and welled forth again with a rhythm and a harmony becoming the sublime theme. All this is of the essence of the Illuminative way. The soul has grown detached from the things of this world. She has renounced sin and the vanities of life. She has become enamored of the spiritual goods of prayer and the sacraments. The Love and the Light wherewith she is filled diffuse themselves upon her neighbor in charitable thought and kind word and helping deed. Hence, she is zealous for the spiritual well-being of her neighbor and seeks to make it assured by prayer and edification. She has left the way of Nature, "which respecteth the outer things of a man," and adopted those of Grace, "which turneth itself to the inward."¹ She finds comfort in God alone, and regards all else as vain and trifling, except in so far as it leads to God.

In this spirit, and animated by these sentiments, does Dante move from sphere to sphere—each moment soaring higher on the wings of love; for in his own words, "*The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence of burning love and of living hope, which conquer the Divine Will*"²—each moment revealing to him some new truth—each moment adding to the brilliancy of the smile of his Beatrice as she approaches nearer to the Fountain of Light and Life and Love—admiration on his lips, love in his heart and ecstasy in his soul; all in harmony with that "harmony and sweetness that can never be known save where joy is everlasting."³ The splendor of the eternal Sun that illumines all the lights in Heaven, now comes within his vision and through the living light appears the shining substance of the glorified body of the Redeemer, and its radiance dazzles his gaze: "Here is the Wisdom and the Power which opened the roads between heaven and earth."⁴ And now Beatrice would wean the poet from interpreting all things in her countenance, and initiate him into a higher state of spiritual life by contemplating heavenly things in themselves: "*Why*," she says, "*so enamors thee my face that thou turnest not to the beautiful garden which flowereth under Christ's beams? Here is the Rose wherein the Divine Word was made flesh; here are the lilies whose odor attracted into the*

¹ De Imitatione, Lib. iii., Cap. 31, 5.

² *Regnum caelorum* violenza pate
Da caldo amore e da viva speranza,
Che vince la Divina Voluntate.—Paradiso, xx., 94-96.

³ Paradiso, x., 146-148.

⁴ Paradiso, xxiii., 38-39.

good way.”¹ It need not be said that Mary is here that mystical Rose. She is preëminent among all God’s creatures. Her effulgence adds to the brilliance of the whole heavens. Saint and angel love her with a special love and pay her a special honor of praise and veneration, their deep love attracting them towards her as the babe is drawn towards the mother.² She is extolled with a special fervor and her name resounds with a special enthusiasm.³

It were an injustice to the Catholic spirit of the poem to overlook the loving homage paid to Mary from its first canto, when she sends succor to Dante, to its last, when St. Bernard sings her praises with a sweetness of expression, a depth of philosophy and a tenderness of feeling that have never been surpassed in human language. Critics may not have any sympathy with this devotion; but none the less should they appreciate its beneficial influence upon conduct, art and letters. Dante gave us the lofty creation of a Beatrice—so ideal and spiritual—because he was devout to Mary. Were there no Virgin-Mother, of immaculate purity and dowered with every grace and every virtue, there would have been no ideal of womanhood, such as Dante conceived; and let us add, the less reverent Goethe would have missed in his masterpiece the central conception of the purifying influence of woman’s love, and the meaning-laden words—“the Eternal-Womanly—*das Ewigweibliche*—draws us on and upward”—would have remained uninscribed among the ineffaceable expressions of world-thought.

The poet ascends into the Empyrean. He is now in a transition state passing from the Illuminative Way to intimate union with the Godhead. New and wonderful visions present themselves to his admiring gaze, bringing home to him truths equally new and wonderful in that resplendent temple “bounded only by love and light.” Beatrice tells him in accents clear and sweet: “*We have issued forth from the last body to the heaven which is unbodied light; light intellectual full of love; love of true good full of joy; joy surpassing every sweetness.*”⁴ Round him flashes a living light. Its effulgence at first dims all vision; but gradually its grandeur and beauty and significancy unfold themselves. “The Divine Light first is seen in the form of a River, signifying Its effusion on the creatures, the living Sparks issuing from It are the Angels; the Flowers they ingem,

¹ *Ibid.*, 70-75.

² Paradiso, xxiii., 121-126.

³ Così la circolata melodia
Si sigillava, e tutti gli altri lumi
Facen sonar lo nome di MARIA.—*Ibid.*, 109-111.

⁴ Noi semo usciti fuore
Del maggior corpo al ciel ch’è pura luce;
Luce intellettual piena d’amore,
Amor di vero ben pien di letizia,
Letizia che trascende ogni dolore.—Paradiso, xxx., 39-43.

the Saints. Then in the changing of the River's length to the Lake's roundness is figured the return of all creatures into God as their Centre and End."¹ Finally, the Light Divine assumes the shape of a Rose composed of souls burning with Love and basking in the unveiled Presence: "In form of a white-rose displayed itself to me the holy company whom Christ in His own blood espoused."² And the hosts of angels flit like bees, descending to the Rose and ascending to where its bliss abideth evermore—in a constant tremor of love and gladness, and dispensing throughout the Rose the peace and the ardor with which they were thrilled.³ This wonderful Rose exhales the love with which it is fed, and it thrills with the gladness diffused by the three-fold light of God, penetrating the whole universe and making it to smile. High up does his Beatrice take her place, reflecting in dazzling radiance the eternal glory.

The poet now enters upon the Unitive Way, under the guidance of the contemplative—*quel contemplante*⁴—St. Bernard. Benign joy suffused his eyes and his cheeks, in gesture kind as befits a tender father.⁵ In this state the soul has no further need of doctrine; she has transcended the reasonings and imaginings of men; she is about to enter upon the beatific vision, and who more competent to induct her than he who experienced it in his own life and beautifully described it in his book?⁶ "This joyous existence," Bernard cautions the poet, "will not be known to thee, if thou only holdest thine eyes down."⁷ Whereby the Saint would inculcate that one must first be detached from all things of earth if one would enjoy the state of perfect union with God. But this is not given to man upon his own merits; it is a special favor of Divine Grace and Mercy, and can be obtained only by earnest prayer. And so, Bernard beseeches for the poet the special grace of ecstatic union with the Godhead, through Mary's intercession, in that marvellous outburst of song that exhausts all that can be sung or said in praise of Heaven's Queen, though it seems never to exhaust the admiration bestowed upon it: "*Thou maid and mother, daughter of thy Son; thou humble and high over every creature: thou didst so ennoble our nature that He who made it disdained not to be of its make. In thy womb was enkindled the love through whose warmth in the eternal peace this Flower has thus sprung. . . . In thee is mercy; in thee is pity; in thee are mighty deeds; in thee is united all the goodness that may in creature be. . . . I beseech*

¹ Maria F. Rossetti. A Shadow of Dante, p. 272. In which the author refers to Venturi as the source of this interpretation.

² Paradiso, xxxi., 1-3.

³ Paradiso, xxxi., 7-17.

⁴ Paradiso, xxxii., 1.

⁵ Paradiso, xxxi., 61-63.

⁶ In his treatise on the Love of God. See Görres, *La Mystique* t. i., p. 101.

⁷ Paradiso, xxxi., 112-114.

thee that thou wouldst with thy prayers unloose every cloud from his mortality, so that the highest bliss may be unfolded to him and that thou preserve whole and blameless his affection after so great a sight."¹ Forthwith the saint's prayer is granted. "My vision becoming undimmed," says the poet, "more and more entered the beam of light, which in itself is Truth."² The veil has dropped. The poet enjoys the ecstatic vision. He penetrates essences. In that single glance mysteries the most profound become unravelled. He sees the harmony existing through all grades of the universe, bound together in ineffable beauty and order—their music penetrating his soul—and all united in the golden bonds of Love Divine. He sees and feels; the sweetness born of the vision is infused into his heart; but language has no word in which to express the splendor he beholds and the rapture that thrills him. And the vision confirms him in good resolve and strong purpose. In that blissful state, where each longing is perfect, ripe and whole,³ his yearning for the Good and the Perfect changes to determination of will to seek and possess them: "Already," he tells us, "my desire and my will rolled onward, like a wheel in even motion, swayed by the Love that moves the Sun and all the stars."⁴ Henceforth the sole law of his action shall be the Love that rules the universe. In obedience to the Divine Will shall he work out his mission on earth; in all things resigned thereto and living therefor; walking through life in the clear light of Faith, with heart beating high in Hope, and soul aflame with all-embracing Charity.

X.

Such is the Spiritual Sense of the *Divina Commedia*. We have traced it, a golden thread running through the whole extent of the poem; we have found that sense, with the prophet of old, dictating the first line;⁵ its notes resound strong and clear in the very last verses of the sublime canticle; on it are strung the brightest pearls of thought and the rarest gems of diction; by means of it are all the parts of the great poem solidly welded together, and unity and harmony given to the whole; it has been the chief inspiration of the poet, sustaining him in his highest soarings and dictating his sublimest songs. Other senses are to be found in the poem. In parts it has its political sense; in parts it has its purely moral sense; in others again it has its philosophical sense; but the sense that pervades the whole, determines its meaning and bearing, and makes of it the great world-poem, is the Spiritual Sense. The other senses are employed critically: to find fault, or to sound the

¹ Paradiso, xxxiii., 1-40.

³ Paradiso, xxii., 64.

⁵ Isaiah, xxxviii., 10.

² *Ibid.*, 52-54.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xxxiii., 143-145.

note of warning ; to praise or approve, or commend ; to expound a theory or explain a difficulty. The Spiritual Sense is used constructively. It has built up the poem into that grand climax of thought and aspiration—the sublimest ever reached by human genius—with which the poet closes. The clue to this sense, indeed every clue to the poem, is to be found in the *Paradiso*. Carlyle called this portion, to him, “a kind of inarticulate music.”¹ It is not to be wondered at. The music of the *Paradiso* is the music of spiritual life ; and the music of spiritual life can be interpreted only by those into whose existence spiritual life enters as a living and breathing reality. The music of that sublime canticle is a music articulate and familiar to each religious man. It throbs in his every aspiration. His ear has been attuned to its exquisite cadences ; its harmony vibrates through the pages of the spiritual book he reads ; it is reëchoed in the sermons and exhortations he hears and in the hymns he chants ; his whole life is the clearest commentary upon this great poem, rather it is itself the living poem of which Dante has made a marvellous though still imperfect translation. In the sublimest themes of that translation he recognizes echoes of the thoughts, sentiments and aspirations that in his own breast are continuously humming unspeakable music. The fervor and love and high thought that are all so grandly intensified in the terse rhythm of this great poem, are the fervor and love and high thought that are daily moving tens of thousands of men and women, to lead the spiritual life herein portrayed in obedience to the Love Divine that rules hearts and sways the heavens in perpetual harmony. The religious man, in sauntering through the vast aisles and chapels of this noble Cathedral of song, here admiring a tender and touching picture, there gazing upon a scene of terror portrayed in vivid colors, again drinking in the sweet and inspiring strains of its clear organ-tones, feels that beneath its solemn arches his soul may rest, for he is at home in his Father’s House.

¹ Heroes and Hero-Worship. Lect., iii.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

WHAT IT IS, AND WHAT ARE ITS RELATIONS TO IRELAND.

THE objection made in the British Parliament and press to Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme for Ireland—that it would be a dissolution of the British Empire—naturally leads to the questions—What is the British Empire? And how would home rule for Ireland dissolve it?

Self government in Ireland could only produce that result, either because it was such an infraction of the constitution as would destroy it, or because the practical and necessary operation of the government could not be afterwards carried on, or because the Articles of Union were sacred and irrepealable, to remain untouched and unchanged for all time. But the British Empire has no constitution covering and applicable to the whole Empire; theoretically, therefore, Parliament might deal as it pleased with a part of the people or territory, and yet not infringe the constitution.

But, first, let us see what the British Empire is—of what it is composed—how it has grown up and how administered.

The British Empire and the Kingdom of Great Britain are by no means the same. The latter consists only of the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, while the former embraces them and all provinces, colonies, and possessions everywhere and of every sort. These exist in all the continents and seas of the world. The most extensive, populous, and valuable are, of course, those in India. And to show their extent, we have only to recollect that Gibbon, in describing the power and vastness, the almost incredible extent of the Roman Empire, estimated that a hundred and twenty millions of people were subject to it, and to note that these provinces of British India alone have a population of two hundred and forty millions, or just twice as many as the whole Roman possessions in the palmiest days of that city. And it has taken only a little over a century to acquire this immense territory and subjugate this enormous number of people. The East India Company existed long before any part of India was actually seized. Historians generally fix the battle of Plassey, which was fought on the 23d of June, 1757, as the real beginning of the British Empire in the east. But Fort George, which was the nucleus of Madras, was the first ground acquired, and this was not until 1765. Once begun,

however, the acquisitions have been made steadily and rapidly—the latest being Burmah, which has a population of four millions and an area of two hundred thousand square miles, and is represented to be fertile, and of special value because it gives an outlet for trade towards China.

British India, at this date, contains thirteen provinces and one hundred and fifty feudatory states and principalities, all under English administration. About one-third of the territory, with fifty-five millions of people, is still under the rule of the hereditary rulers, permitted by the English to maintain courts and make a show of authority and sovereignty; the British, meanwhile, being the actual rulers.

This enormous dependency is not under any uniform government applicable to the whole and administered in the same way throughout. On the contrary, each province or department has its own laws and civil polity. Aymer, Bevar, Mysore, Coorg are under the direct control of the Viceroy or Governor-General, who is appointed by the Crown. He is assisted by a Council, and they together exercise all legislative and executive powers; they not only make laws, but also execute and administer them. Every executive order and every legislative statute runs in the name of the Governor-General-in-Council. The Viceroy is king and prime minister and, in some sense, the Parliament.

The Council, which aids and coöperates with him, is two-fold:

1. The Executive Council, consisting of six, besides the Viceroy, and constituting something like a cabinet.
2. The Legislative Council, of which the Viceroy and the Executive Council are members—the remainder being made up of the governors of the provinces where the Council sits for the time, and official delegates from Madras and Bombay, and certain nominated members, intended to represent non-official communities, both European and native. This body has no fixed time or place of meeting, but assembles wherever and at whatever time legislation is supposed to be needed.

The two largest, most populous, and richest departments—Madras and Bombay—are under the control of governors appointed by the Crown, while Bengal, the Northwestern Provinces, and Punjab are governed by lieutenant-governors; and Oudh, the Central Provinces, British Burmah, and Assam have assigned to them officers called Chief Commissioners, who, like the Viceroy, the Governors and Lieutenant-Governors, are appointed by the Crown and have the same class of powers.

But besides these, there are, as we have already said, about one hundred and fifty feudatory provinces, each with its own native hereditary ruler, called by different names in different states, and

each, in its own domestic economy, governed by its own laws and customs—all, however, under the general control and supervision of the Viceroy. The native prince or potentate is the nominal governing power, the Viceroy the real, who, however, does not interfere except in case of necessity.

As one general system of government does not exist, neither is there a general code of laws. One legislative body and one code are generally considered enough for any people; but British India has no less than three law-making bodies, and no less than five sets of laws:

1. And chief of these is, of course, the British Parliament, whose acts, however, do not affect India or any part of it, unless specially named in the law itself.
2. The statutes of the Viceroy and Council.
3. The statutes of each separate division acting for itself alone.
4. The old Hindu and Mahometan laws relating to inheritance, which are of great antiquity and are still preserved and in force.
5. Laws relating to particular castes or races.

The religion, if it can be called so, of this region is as various as the laws and governments:

1. Hindu—numbering about one hundred and forty millions.
2. Mahometan—about forty-one millions.
3. Buddhist—about three millions.
4. Sikhs—about one million three hundred thousand.
5. Christians—chiefly Catholics—about nine hundred thousand.

This curious and anomalous condition of things is not peculiar to this part only of the British Empire; the same thing applies to every part of it, not excepting the Kingdom itself, for there in that little island we see the same variety of race, of language, of religion, of law, and of government, as in India.

The British Isles consist, as we all know, of Great Britain, Ireland, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands, altogether making a small and compact territory; and it would seem that here, at least, the people ought to be content with one uniform government and one general system of laws. But things are almost as variant there as they are in India. England is Episcopalian and Scotland Presbyterian; they have each their own land laws, their own mode of administering justice, and their own judicial system and marriage laws. Ireland is Catholic, and besides being governed as Scotland is by the King and Parliament, it is put under the control and surveillance of a Lord-Lieutenant who resides in Dublin, and there holds a court resembling that of Her Majesty in London, and is in fact the representative of the Crown in Ireland.

But the Isle of Man presents one of the most curious and vener-

able spectacles in the world. Neither it nor the Channel Isles, containing a population of a hundred and fifty thousand, and being parts of the Kingdom, are represented in Parliament. They stand to this day under what is claimed to be one of the freest countries of the earth, and one in which the personal rights of the citizens are protected to a greater degree and with more scrupulous care than anywhere else, monuments of taxation without representation. Perhaps it was the precedent afforded by them that Mr. Gladstone proposed to follow when he brought in his bill for home rule in Ireland, one of the provisions of which was that Ireland should elect no members to the Imperial Parliament, but should nevertheless be liable to taxation by that body.

The Isle of Man has a Governor appointed by the Crown. It has a Council which constitutes the upper branch of the legislature, and a lower branch called the House of Keys. These three bodies constitute the Court of Tynwald, and all sit and act together in the deliberations of that tribunal. Acts of Parliament do not affect the Isle at all, unless specially named. The Governor is Captain-General of the forces; he presides in the Council and all courts of Tynwald, and is the sole Judge of the Chancery and Exchequer courts. The Council consists of the Lord Bishop of the diocese, the Attorney-General, the two Deemsters and the Clerk of the Rolls, the Water Bailiff, the Receiver-General, the Archdeacon, and the Vicar General—all except the last appointed by the Crown. The House of Keys has twenty-four members, elected—and here comes in a surprising feature—by the male owners and occupiers of property and the female owners of property. While the woman's rights people in this country have been agitating and haranguing and petitioning Congress and State legislatures to give the ballot to women, these have been voting from time immemorial in the Isle of Man.

What are called Deemsters are judicial officers having peculiar and exceptional functions. Exactly when or how they originated, who made them and who gave them their name and jurisdiction, cannot be ascertained. The order has existed so long that no authentic records can be found of its beginning or origin, but they are claimed, and believed, to be successors of the Druids, and are regarded by the simple people with something of the same veneration supposed to have been felt for that order.

We are sure the reader will agree that all this exhibits a most remarkable and interesting spectacle. Here is an island, close to the shores of Great Britain, forming an integral part of the Kingdom, paying its taxes for the support of the whole nation, and yet not represented in the body which imposes taxes upon it. The same man is Governor-General, President of the Council and of the Court

of Tynwald, Judge of the Court of Exchequer, Chancellor, and Commander-in-Chief of the army.

Guernsey and the other Channel Islands stand to the Empire very much as does the Isle of Man. Alderney, Sark and Herm, and the smaller adjacent islands, are in the same bailiwick with Guernsey; and they, like the Isle of Man, have no representation in Parliament, though they have home rule, but still of a different variety. They, of course, have a Governor appointed by the Crown, and their Parliamentary Assembly is of very mixed material, consisting as it does of a Bailiff, twelve Jurats, an Attorney-General, the beneficed clergy and twelve delegates elected by the people. No other legislative body ever brought together anywhere is like it, for in it are men appointed by the Crown, men who are members by virtue of some other official position, parsons sent there from England by their bishops or designated by some layman who holds a benefice, and, lastly, delegates chosen by the people. But this body, made up of what seems to be such discordant elements, must be, nevertheless, a wise and prudent one, and those islands must be good places to live in, for the whole revenue raised by taxation is only £10,000 a year, and the population is as peaceful, quiet, kind, and law-abiding as is to be found anywhere on the globe.

Although the Channel Islands have belonged to Great Britain for many centuries, yet the old Norman French is the prevalent language, while English is taught in the schools and modern French used in the courts. The old Norman system of land tenure is still in force, the land being divided into very small parcels, five acres constituting a pretty good farm.

While the Channel Islands still use the old Norman French, the Manx language continues to prevail in the Isle of Man, and is used almost entirely by the peasantry.

The possessions already mentioned, extensive as they are, constitute by no means the greatest and most important of the British Empire. To give a detailed account of them would be almost as tedious as is the list which Homer furnishes of the ships that brought the Greeks to Troy. Nevertheless, a list of them, together with some sketch of the manner in which the larger part are governed, is essential to the proper development of the idea attempted to be enforced in this article. As we have already given some account of India, it may be well enough here to add that it is not all that Britain owns in Asia, and we will continue the descriptive list with the other territories in that country or adjacent to it.

There are, in addition to India, Aden, Ceylon, Cyprus, Hong Kong, Labrian, Perim, and the Straits Settlements. These are not insignificant, since Ceylon has a population of two millions eight hundred thousand, the Straits Settlements of five hundred and

twenty-five thousand, and Cyprus of two hundred thousand. Perim has but one hundred and fifty men, women, and children, all told, and is probably the smallest and most insignificant place upon which England has set her foot. But we may be sure that there was some special reason for seizing that little island, for the rulers of the British Empire are not content alone with land of agricultural, mineral or commercial value, but want as well all places that may be of service as military posts, where supplies can be stored for army and navy, and ships of war or trade can touch with convenience and profit. It has been less than ten years since Lord Beaconsfield acquired Cyprus; which is financially an expense, but of incalculable value to Great Britain whenever the great war in the East, which may blaze out any day and is sure to come at last, takes place. There her ships can find harbor, water and supplies; there her troops can be stationed within easy reach of Egypt and the Suez Canal on the one side, and Asia, the Dardanelles, the Black Sea, and Constantinople on the other. Perim may have some such smaller value, and may be a Cyprus on a diminished scale.

In Europe, besides Great Britain itself and Ireland and the adjacent Islands, the Empire has Gibraltar, Heligoland, Malta, and Gozo. Gibraltar is nothing but a fortress maintained at considerable cost, and Malta was obtained and held for the same reasons as Cyprus is, and is of much the same importance and value in military affairs. It was seized less than a hundred years ago, and, though it is only about seventeen miles long and nine broad, it has remarkably fine and safe harbors, and is convenient to all parts of the Mediterranean and the countries surrounding it.

In the new growth of Africa and the scramble of all nations for it, we may be sure that Great Britain has not been idle or procrastinating, but has got a good share. She has held some positions in that country for more than two centuries, and has continued to add to her original foothold whatever she could take and was found valuable. Her mode of proceeding is simple and summary. She sees something, she covets, and forthwith an Act of Parliament is passed making it a part of Her Majesty's dominion and establishing over it such form of government as seems to suit the country, the people and the situation. Her first acquisitions were of course on the coast, but she has recently annexed, in the usual manner and in a very quiet and matter of fact way, a great part of the interior, and has called it by the general name of Bechuanaland. Her provinces in Africa are Cape Colony, Ascension, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Gambia, Gold Coast, Lagos, Mauritius, Natal, Sierra Leone and St. Helena.

Cape Colony, which embraces the extreme south of the continent

of Africa, is large and prosperous and has about one million and a quarter of inhabitants, the Gold Coast four hundred thousand, Natal four hundred and twenty-five thousand, and Mauritius about four hundred thousand.

In Bechuanaland one man is both governor and legislator; in him are centered and combined all the legislative and executive powers and duties over an area already containing several millions of people and capable of supporting not less than forty millions. He makes the laws, he executes the laws, and does the former by proclamation merely. But the native population is ignorant, and not barbarous only, but savage and know-nothing, and cares for nothing beyond the daily wants.

Half a century ago the great and fertile region now called by the general term of Australasia was almost unknown and entirely unexplored. Such parts of it as were reduced at all from the native condition of the country, were used for the exportation of criminals. Now they are great and prospering provinces, all owned by the British. They are the Fiji Islands, Rotumah, New South Wales, Norfolk Island, New Zealand, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia and New Guinea.

Port Jackson, in New South Wales, was first established as a penal colony in 1788. Then it was a wilderness, inhabited by a race of blacks probably the same, originally, as the negro, but modified somewhat by climate and surroundings. Now it is a highly civilized country, where all the arts, enjoyments and refinements of life can be found.

Settlements were made from time to time in other parts of Australasia, and governments placed over them whenever any considerable number of British subjects got together. How rapid this progress has been a reference to the census will show.

The Fiji Islands,	128,414	people.
New South Wales,	921,268	"
Queensland,	309,913	"
South Australia,	312,781	"
Tasmania,	130,541	"
Victoria,	961,276	"
Western Australia,	32,958	"
Total,	2,797,151	"

We are accustomed to speak and think of the growth of the United States as unequalled anywhere else, yet it took three centuries to bring its population up to three millions, which it was at the time of the Revolution. But in about half a century Australasia has attained the same strength and numbers that the American colonies had when they took the perilous step of declaring them-

selves independent. And this estimate only embraces Australasia proper, not taking in New Zealand, which is practically a part of it. Great as has been the rate of progress in Australasia, that of New Zealand has exceeded it largely. It has not been very long since the natives of that island were cannibals. In 1851 its whole population was estimated at about twenty-six thousand; on the 30th of June, 1885, it was, by accurate account, 616,229, nearly all of them British born subjects, since the Maoris, or aborigines, were only forty thousand.

Only a little more than a year ago the British Parliament passed what is called the Federal Council Act of Australasia, forming a union somewhat similar to the Union of States in the United States and in the Dominion of Canada. The Act defines very fully the mode of choosing this Council and its powers and duties. And while, in the event of that country ever wanting to separate from the mother country, this would enable it to act with much greater concert and effectiveness, its present tendency is, undoubtedly, to attach it more strongly to the British Crown.

We have made this necessarily brief reference to and account of the British colonies, provinces and dependencies in Asia, Africa and the semi-continent of Australasia, and come now to the other great continent, America, and the seas and oceans surrounding it.

The Dominion of Canada stretches from ocean to ocean across North America where it is broader than any part of the United States. It has a thrifty population of four millions and a half. To hold the provinces together and give them an identity of interest, the Canada Pacific railroad has been constructed at very great cost, striking the Pacific Ocean at Puget Sound, and giving Great Britain a short route to her Australasian and Asiatic possessions, over her own territory, in one direction, while the Suez Canal does it in another. This will greatly facilitate her intercourse with the East, and be a route that no European nation can interfere with. That a great city will be built on Puget Sound, and that it will become a mart for Asiatic trade, the present situation clearly indicates.

Canada, or rather British America, will share so largely in the benefits of this trade and development that a motive for cutting loose from Great Britain will be wanting. She now has self-government, and is content to come in, in addition, for a good share of the glories and wealth of the Empire.

This great space of the world's surface occupies nearly the whole of the northern part of the continent. And Great Britain has been just as careful and thoughtful in planting herself on the southern part of the American continent as the northern; and her possessions there, though not so extensive, are, nevertheless, well located. They

are Honduras and Guiana; and a look at the map will show that they are within easier reach of and more accessible to the United States, Mexico, Central America and the West Indies than any part of South America.

Guiana constitutes, as respects variety of people, a very fair epitome of the British Empire. Its population consists of:

Native Negroes,	80,000
Cross between Indians and Chinese,	10,000
East Indians,	42,000
Chinese,	6,000
From Madras and the Azores,	8,000
Negroes from West Indies,	14,000
Europeans,	10,000

The places named so far are on the mainland; but islands seem to have an especial attraction for the English. In American waters and adjacent to both continents they have the Bahamas, Bermudas, Falkland Islands, Jamaica, Turks and Caicos Islands, Leeward Islands, Newfoundland, Trinidad, and the Windward Islands. So far as the West Indies are concerned, they belong naturally to the United States, yet Great Britain holds several of the most important and valuable. How much they keep her in her commercial rivalry with this country, we the people of the United States know.

The British have been as fortunate or as far-seeing and wise in selecting and securing military posts everywhere as they have been in obtaining the richest and most valuable possessions. The little ocean of the Mediterranean has always been, and will of necessity continue to be, the great theatre of naval conflicts and naval operations. The East is, and has been, the volcanic war region. It was necessary, therefore, for a first-class power which had such diverse and general interests to place itself in a good attitude there. This England has done with the most consummate wisdom and far-seeing sagacity. She has Gibraltar at the entrance to the sea, inside she has seized Malta, which, though only a small island, yet has harbors in which all her navy can safely ride at once. The purchase of a controlling interest in the Suez Canal, and the acquisition, the fortification and garrisoning of Cyprus, were almost simultaneous acts and parts of the same great purpose—to protect and secure her route to Asia and put her in good position for the war that she knows must come. And these places, it is to be observed, geographically and naturally belong to other nations. The Channel Islands are parts of France, Cyprus of Turkey, the West Indies of the United States, yet Great Britain owns them all.

Any account of the British Empire, in the pages of a periodical, must necessarily be brief; yet this has been long enough to enable

us to repeat pertinently the questions asked at the beginning: What is the British Empire? And what holds it together? It exists in every part of the world, civilized or savage. Among all the savage peoples of the earth its subjects are to be found. White, red and black take part alike in making it up. It is the most incongruous body, and at the same time the most wonderful, ever created. Among most other great nations and powers there has been, and is, some degree, at least, of homogeneity. But in the British Empire there is absolutely none, not even in Great Britain. There are found Celts, Saxons, Normans, and Welsh. The remainder of the Empire is made of materials that it would seem impossible ever to get together, or to hold together if once united. And it is not only difference of race, but of religion and customs also, that adds to the singularity of the condition of things and the apparent difficulty of governing all these people, keeping them content, or at least quiet, and procuring their acquiescence in and submission to one authority, and that authority located in a little island distant from most of them; for all these territories and people are ruled from London. Whatever home rule or domestic constitution they may have, in London resides the supreme authority over all. And in some cases the actual ruling power remains in London, as in the case of Borneo, which is on the other side of the world from England, yet is governed by a Board of Directors which has its office and holds its sessions in London.

To form an adequate idea of the extent of this Empire it is only necessary to know that it covers one-seventh of the surface of the earth and contains one-ninth of its population; and that its territories and dependencies have been so well selected and so judiciously located that its ships of war and peace can go nowhere, into no ocean or sea, that they will not find some of their own lands to shelter them.

If the question were asked, as an original proposition, could such an empire as this, composed of nations and peoples of different and divergent races, colors, religions, tastes, habits, customs, and physical characteristics, and the parts separated from each other by the whole circumference of the globe, be first constructed, and when constructed afterwards maintained, the universal answer would be, No. But, finding it in actual existence, the next inquiry would be: What holds it together, what is the cement that unites and the power that welds these discordant elements? Is it force or trade or mutual advantage, or all combined? All have contributed; but it has been mainly by reason of the fact that whenever a territory was acquired, either by conquest, purchase, or peaceful annexation, the first thing done was to study the people, find out how they had lived, what were their tastes and desires, what would

please and what displease them, and then adapt this rule to the situation. The religion, the customs, and the laws of the conquered or bought people were respected. They were granted home rule and permitted to govern themselves, as to their domestic affairs, which is all the bulk of mankind knows or cares anything for. Besides this, the English have traded with these people, bought whatever they had to sell, if not with money, at least with something the savage heart delighted in ; and have gradually improved their physical condition.

Of course, all this has been of incalculable advantage to the people of Great Britain and has made the British Empire far the most powerful that exists or ever existed. We do not by this mean military power so much as social, commercial, financial, and political. It and its citizens have more to do with the business and trade of the world than all the rest combined ; they transact more and influence more of it. They come all the distance across the Atlantic and almost monopolize the trade of Mexico, which lies at our very door. A man in the United States who wishes to send a letter to Brazil, has to send it by way of England. And this is one source of her strength. She has managed to make herself useful.

From the foregoing narration, it is very clear that the British Empire has no constitution in the sense understood by us in the United States ; and that the one principle that runs through and pervades what is called the Constitution of the Empire is that each part of it may be and should be governed in the manner specially suited to it and best calculated to secure its advancement, prosperity, and fidelity ; and that this process, so far from being a dissolution of the Empire, or a threat in that direction, is the real cause of its stability and power.

To this principle, enforced everywhere else, and ruling in all the dealings of the Imperial Parliament with all other parts of the Empire, there is one exception, one land and one people that has never been allowed to rule itself, whose religion has been persecuted, who has been denied the enjoyment of the privileges of citizenship on account of its faith, whose customs have been trampled upon, whose ancient laws and usages have been suppressed ; this is Ireland, which though a conquered province, has been administered and governed in a different manner from any other part of the Empire. And all this has been done while Irish generals were leading the armies of the Empire to victory, and Irish soldiers fighting her battles wherever an enemy was to be met.

To conciliate the Welsh, these people have been allowed to preserve their old traditions and customs.

In the Channel Islands the successors of the Druids are the judges who administer justice, and even the women are allowed to vote for the men whom the British Parliament permits to make their domestic laws and manage their domestic affairs. The Hindus and Buddhists, who have such a stolid adherence to their religion that there is small hope of ever making Christians of them; the fanatic and aggressive Mahometans, who are not content to be allowed to practice their religious rites in peace and quiet, but want to make proselytes of the world, have their own religion. The laws under which they lived before their conquest was effected are still carefully guarded and protected, courts are specially constituted to keep alive their old laws, and the real property of the country is held and inherited under them. Toleration and favor are shown to every phase of belief, or non-belief,—to the Pagan, the Heathen, all Protestant sects, by whatever name designated; in brief, to all the world and all the peoples, except the Catholics of Ireland. Even Borneo, savage and ignorant Borneo, has two sets of courts; one to administer the laws made by the present government, and another the old Mahometan laws. And while the persecution was in progress on the alleged pretext that the Irish were not loyal to the Imperial Government, Catholic Irish soldiers were helping Wellington, an Irish general, to win the battle of Waterloo against a nation of Catholics.

These examples make the conclusion inevitable that, as self-government exists with the consent and by the establishment of the British Parliament in almost all parts of the Empire, and is, in fact, a settled and fixed rule, enforced at once whenever new territory is acquired by arms or treaty, nobody can object to self-government in Ireland on constitutional grounds. So far as the Constitution, so-called, regulates and provides for the matter, in any way, it is just the reverse, and demands and requires and makes it obligatory on the authorities to grant, in some form, to Ireland the same rights at home and on her own soil that Canada, Australasia, Borneo, Bechuanaland, the Isle of Man, and other places enjoy on their soil.

The Constitution, therefore, is not the obstacle. The reason for the prolonged, never ending denial to Ireland of equality with other British subjects must be looked for somewhere else—perhaps, in the Articles of Union between Great Britain and Ireland. We have recently examined that document, in view of its possible bearing on the questions now so important to the people of those countries and which are agitating them so profoundly, and found nothing in it to prohibit, in an even remote degree, any plan for home rule or self-government that Parliament may choose to adopt. But even if there was, is that compact to stand forever, let what will happen,

to be always sacred and inviolable, never to be touched, altered, or modified in the slightest degree, no matter what the emergency and how great the interests that demand the modification? Such a claim is neither law nor reason. As all such things are supposed to be done for the benefit of the parties concerned, and that is the principle that underlies all government, it would be nothing but stupid and criminal folly that should permit this law to stand unchanged when a change becomes necessary in order to accomplish the very results it was intended to bring about, but has failed to effect. Neither is it law, for in a matter of government merely no legislative body can bind its successors irrevocably or do any act that it or its successors cannot undo.

But we are not without precedent on this point. Parliament has already shown, in a most conspicuous and important way, one which touched the people of both islands on a matter always cherished by them, that the Articles of Union have no such sanctity as to interfere, in the least, with whatever measures it is thought good to pass.

Article V. of the Articles of Union provides: "That the church of that part of Great Britain called England and that of Ireland should be united into one church, and the Archbishops, Bishops, deans and clergy of the churches of England and Ireland shall, from time to time, be summoned to, and entitled to sit in, convocation of the United Church, in like manner and subject to the same regulations as are at present by law established with respect to like orders of the Church of England, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the United Church shall be preserved, as by law now established for the Church of England."

"And that the continuance and preservation *forever* of the said United Church as the Established Church of that part of the United Kingdom called England and Ireland shall be deemed and taken to be an *essential and fundamental condition of the Treaty of Union.*"

This article to continue *forever*, to be preserved *forever* and taken as an *essential and fundamental condition* of the Treaty of Union!

This was the very gist of the Union, its kernel—the feature that recommended it most to Protestant England—that gave the dignitaries and convocations control over the rebellious Catholics, that would furnish the means to keep them under foot, and ultimately stamp out their faith, while forcing its adherents, meanwhile, to support another. Surely it cannot be touched; whatever else falls, it must remain; it is an essential and fundamental condition of the Union; and if it has been repealed or abrogated, then the Union is already gone; it cannot exist after a fundamental and essential feature is destroyed. Yet that is exactly what has been done;

this article has been absolutely set aside and annulled, there is no longer any union of the Churches of England and Ireland. The Church has been disestablished in Ireland, and if the Articles of Union did not stand in the way of this, how is it that they can be claimed to be an obstacle now?

Neither the Constitution nor the Articles of Union, then, are incompatible with the measure for the self-government of Ireland. The real reason for opposition to it is the old one of hostility to the Catholics. It is said that the Orangemen of Ulster are arming to resist, and it has been reported, though denied, that Lord Wolseley says he is ready to lead them. Ulster is the province in Ireland where the Catholics are in a minority. Out of a total population in Ireland of 5,412,377, Ulster has 1,743,075, a bare majority of whom are Protestants. And Mr. Chamberlain, the leader of the Radical party in England, carries his home rule views so far that he actually wants to have a separate government for Ulster. He does not wish the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland to unite in one government for the whole, which shall consult the good of the entire island, but he proposes that while the Catholics in the other provinces may govern themselves, the Protestants in Ulster shall govern the Catholics of that province. He desires to accumulate government on Ireland, and let it still have the Imperial Parliament: one home government for Ulster and another for the remaining provinces combined. This scheme is, of course, foolish, and can never be adopted; and we only advert to it at all to furnish another example, if one were needed, of the motives which lie at the bottom of the opposition to Home Rule.

THE CHURCH AND HER HOLYDAYS.¹

OUR Lord sets forth His royalty clearly. He is a king. "For this was I born, for this I came into the world." The Wise Men of the East at His birth proclaimed Him a king; the representative of the Roman Emperor wrote on the cross the acknowledgment of His kingly rank. He spoke constantly of His kingdom. He disposed it to His twelve Apostles, the peers of His realm, as His Father had disposed it to Him; He committed the chief power to Peter. Standing as King of kings, the Queen Mother stands near him.

In this Kingdom the loyal subjects have their holydays, the birthday of the great King, the days that commemorate His mighty deeds, His campaigns, His victories, His triumphs; the days given to honor the twelve, whom He sent to conquer the world. Is it strange that in days when loyalty abounded in that Kingdom, when every heart throbbed with zeal to do and endure all for Him, the festival days of the Kingdom were celebrated with earnest, spontaneous outpouring of the heart? Loyalty cannot be purchased or manufactured; patriotism is heartfelt or nothing.

When the royal birthday comes, or the day of a great victory, or the deliverance of the land, and no flag is raised, no voice of gladness is heard, where men speak slightly of the monarch and his service, it is vain to say that the people are faithful in their allegiance, are enthusiastic in support of the throne. No; loyalty and patriotism are dead, and the men who boast most loudly of their fidelity may be put down as most to be doubted.

How do we stand as subjects of the kingdom of God on earth?

The Church, by one of her positive commandments, requires the faithful to sanctify certain holydays in the year, by taking part in the offering of the great sacrifice of the Mass and by abstaining from servile works. To many it has doubtless seemed strange that the holydays thus prescribed were not the same throughout the world, fixed irrevocably, and known by all in every country on the face of the earth. Still more strange has it seemed that in a republic like our own, where the Church, though the oldest of all the institutions existing, can boast of little more than three centuries and a half of history, there have been diversities before the recently held Third Plenary Council of Baltimore made a step towards absolute uniformity.

¹ Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii, A.D. MDCCCLXXXIV. Baltimore, 1886.

Yet so far as this country is concerned, the state of our feasts and fasts excited wonder, not only here, but even in Rome; for years ago the authorities there wrote to this country to inquire into the origin of the diversity.

The holydays of the Church in the course of its history are a kind of meter, showing the days of fervor and the days when faith grew cold, and when all that the spouse of Christ required of her children seemed an onerous burthen, which many sought to shift from their shoulders.

In the days of faith and fervor not only were the great festivals prescribed by the Church, those associated with the life of our Lord and his Blessed Mother, those intimately connected with the work of redemption, and the feasts of the holy apostles by whose ministry the Church was established and the channels of grace led through the world—not only were these kept reverently, but the patronal feast of each country, diocese, and church, the days of the most famous local saints were similarly honored. The devotion was general, and whoso refused to lay aside his implements of trade or traffic on their days was so condemned by public opinion that custom made the law.

The fame of many saints from being local became general, devotion spread to other countries, and then feasts were made obligatory throughout the Church. Devotion to particular mysteries also led to the establishment of special feasts, as in the case of Corpus Christi, to honor the real presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist, and the institution of that sacrament.

The great commercial awakening of Europe that grew out of the Crusades was accompanied by a waning of piety and a manifestation of declining interest in the affairs of God and salvation as men's minds became more absorbed in worldly affairs. The institution of the Friars Minor, by Saint Francis of Assisi, was a direct effort to counteract the spirit of greed and worldliness which was sweeping over Europe; but the fervor of the Franciscan, of Carmelite, Dominican, and Augustinian, who joined in the new movement for the things of God, though it did much, did not triumph. Less and less Christian grew governments, grew nobles and people; more and more did old pagan ideas reassert themselves, and while Christian civilization declined, material prosperity became the great end and aim of man.

Then came the revolt of the sixteenth century. The Church had acquired a certain amount of material wealth, which was at once seized. This property diverted from the general wealth of the country was alleged to be an injury to the commonwealth. In the hands of the princes, their courtiers and favorites, it would lighten the burthen of taxation, establish great public works, found schools

and colleges, institutions for the relief of every human misery, houses where the poor were to acquire the skill to attain the great end for which man was created, earthly riches. But in some way or other this benevolent intention was frustrated, and whether we examine the history of England, France, Germany, Scandinavia, or, more recently, Spain and Italy, the most microscopic research fails to discover the institutions for the public good resulting from the money taken from the Church. On every occasion men were told how much good might be done, and ought to be done with this money, which lay, to use their expression, in a dead hand, and the world naturally looked to see the good that would be done. Was fifty per cent. even applied to any good use? Twenty per cent.? Ten per cent.? One per cent.? It would be hard to find even the one per cent.

Everywhere there is one record. The money and property was squandered without any regard to the benefit of the commonwealth, as it had been seized without any regard to God.

Everywhere, too, it had another effect. The poor were more impoverished. They found their case worse than before. Money was accumulated more in the hands of a few; a bridge, widening year by year, separated the rich and poor as if it spanned a widening gulf. Then it was discovered that the poor did not work enough. In that lay the whole cause of the state of things.

For this the Church was mainly responsible. A great part of the year was taken from work by the Church, which made so many holydays. Protestantism, therefore, at once swept away all the holydays, and Christmas remained almost alone to represent the Church calendar, and the Puritans even punished those who kept Christmas.

With men working all the year round, except on Sunday, wealth was to be general, the poor would thrive and prosper, and be happy and contented, no longer lured from great and ennobling labor by being called away every week to idle some days in church and prayer.

It was again unfortunate that this excellent theory did not work well. The poor seemed to grow actually poorer with all these days of labor than they had been before.

In spite, however, of all theory, the new ideas prevailed, and in Catholic countries men began to complain of the numerous holydays. Dazzled by the apparent prosperity of Protestant countries, they saw only the wealth in the hands of the few, the energy and activity in the pursuit of wealth; they failed to study the deepening degradation of the masses, in whom all Christian instinct, and thought, and hope were dying out, and who were becoming, like

harassed wild beasts, gaunt, conscious of ill usage, but unable to see the real cause or the real creators of their misery.

The Church was already planted in our present territory, and Catholic bodies had begun to form at several points with clergy attending them. Among these the holydays and fasts of obligation were observed according to the usages of the countries from which the settlers came, the feasts and fasts universally observed, and those introduced by the piety, national feeling, or gratitude of their ancestors.

The Diocesan Synod held in 1688 by Bishop Palacios, of Santiago de Cuba, fixed as holydays for that diocese, in which Florida was then embraced, and from 1776 to 1793 Louisiana also, the following: All the Sundays of the year, Circumcision, Epiphany, Purification, St. Mathias, St. Joseph, the Annunciation, Sts. Philip and James, the Finding of the Holy Cross, St. John Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, St. Thomas, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents, and St. Sylvester. Easter Sunday and the two following days, Ascension, Whit-Sunday and two following days, Corpus Christi.

A bull of Pope Clement X. added St. Ferdinand, St. Rose, National Patroness of the Indies; and a bull of Innocent XI. added St. Augustine, August 28th.

The fasting days were all days in Lent, the Ember days, the eves of Christmas, Candlemas, Annunciation, Assumption, All Saints, the feasts of the Apostles, except St. Philip and St. James and St. John, nativity of St. John the Baptist, all Fridays, except within twelve days of Christmas and between Easter and Ascension, and the eve of Ascension.

All Sundays in Lent, all Saturdays throughout the year, Monday and Tuesday before Ascension, and St. Mark's day were days of abstinence from flesh meat.

In Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, which were included in the ecclesiastical province of Mexico, the feasts and fasts were regulated by the Third Council of Mexico.

In these parts, besides those already given, the faithful observed as holy days of obligation: St. Fabian and St. Sebastian (January 20th), St. Thomas Aquinas (March 7th), St. Mark (April 25th), St. Barnabas (June 11th), the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin (July 2d), St. Mary Magdalene (July 22d), St. Dominic (Aug. 4th), the Transfiguration (Aug. 6th), St. Francis (October 4th), St. Luke (Oct. 18th), St. Catharine (Nov. 25th), the Expectation (Dec. 18th),

but not the Holy Innocents and St. Sylvester.—(III. Council of Mexico, pp. 111–112.)

The fast days were all days in Lent, except Sunday, eves of Christmas, Whit-Sunday, St. Mathias, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James, St. Lawrence, Assumption, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew and St. Thomas.

A distinction was made, however, between whites and Indians. As the latter lived a most precarious existence, and were frequently compelled to fast, and, moreover, could not always on holydays be near enough to a church to attend, the obligation on an Indian to hear Mass and rest from servile works was limited to a comparatively small number of feasts.

They were Sundays, Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, Annunciation, Sts. Peter and Paul, Ascension, Corpus Christi, the Assumption, and Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (III. Council of Mexico, p. 117). While the only fast days obligatory on the aboriginal Catholics were the Fridays in Lent, Holy Saturday, and Christmas Eve.

This was in virtue of a bull of Pope Paul III. in favor of the Indians, "*Altitudo Divini Concilii*," issued on the 1st of June, 1537. (Hernaez, Coleccion de Bulas, I., p. 65; III. Concilio Mexicano, pp. 265–267.)

The exemption in favor of the Indians was universally recognized in Spanish America, and was regarded as for the benefit of the natives, so that when held as slaves, they could not be required to work on the other holydays which were not of obligation for them, though they were for the whites. There is nothing in this bull limiting it to the Spanish dominions, in fact, no European State is mentioned at all. It must, therefore, have extended to all parts of the country, and was as obligatory in Canada, and all parts under the diocese of Quebec, Louisiana, Maine, Central New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Louisiana, as in Mexico or Florida. Indeed, it must be in force in our Indian missions to-day, as it must have been in Maryland from the first.

It was found, however, that the holydays, even as restricted by Pope Urban VIII., were too frequently neglected, and Pope Benedict XIV., by his brief, "*Venerabiles Fratres*," issued on the 15th of December, 1750, extended to Spanish America the indulgence already granted to the kingdom of Spain. By this reduction the obligation of hearing mass and resting from servile work was limited to the Sundays of the year, Christmas, St. Stephen, the Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, Easter Monday, Annunciation, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, Ascension, St. John the Baptist,

Sts. Peter and Paul, Assumption, St. James, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, All Saints, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, and the Patron of each place. (Sinodo Diocesano de Santiago de Chile, p. 206.)

These would seem to have been the holydays of obligation in force in the parts of the country originally under Spanish sway when they were purchased by the United States or conveyed to us by treaty: Louisiana, in 1803; Florida, in 1821; Texas, in 1845; New Mexico, Arizona, and California, in 1848.

In Canada the feasts were those of the Reformed Calendar of Pope Urban VIII.; but as custom had made some others obligatory, Bishop Laval, on the 3d of December, 1667, expressly declared the feasts of St. Mark, St. Barnabas, St. Mary Magdalen, St. Luke, and St. Martin not to be of obligation, but he ordered that of St. Anne to be observed as a holyday of obligation in all the country of New France, "as it had pleased God for several years past to display, by many miraculous cures and succors, that this devotion is very pleasing to him, and that He receives graciously the petitions presented to him by her intercession." He also made the feast of St. Francis Xavier obligatory, and in 1687 that of St. Louis.

The holydays of obligation as recognized officially in 1694 were: Christmas, St. Stephen, St. John the Evangelist, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, St. Matthew, St. Joseph, "patron of the country," Annunciation, St. Philip and St. James, St. John the Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, St. Louis, titular of the Cathedral of Quebec, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, St. Simon and St. Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, St. Francis Xavier, the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, titular of the Cathedral, St. Thomas, Easter Monday and Tuesday, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday and Tuesday, Corpus Christi and the patronal feast of each parish. (Register A, Archives de Quebec, pp. 535-537.)

These were the holydays observed in the French settlements in Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois, as well as in Louisiana, Mobile, and the country west of the Mississippi, till that district passing under the Spanish rule was reclaimed about 1776 as part of the diocese of Santiago de Cuba. East of the Mississippi they continued to be in force certainly till the Holy See detached those parts of its territory from the diocese of Quebec and annexed them to the newly erected diocese of Baltimore.

France and Spain still recognized the kingdom of God and the festivals to honor the one true and living God, and the Son whom He had made King of kings, and of those whose love, fidelity, and

services in His cause deserved eternal renown were still kept. Poor England, once boasting to be Our Lady's Dower, was in rebellion, and persecuted with unrelenting hatred all who were loyal to the King, to the mother of the King, and His spouse. Ireland, bound to her by a cruel fate, experienced in her loyalty all the intolerance of successful rebels. In oppression and tears the Catholics of the British Isles kept as best they could, often without Mass, and with no external display, the great holydays of the Church. How many a soul yearned year after year for the happiness of joining once more in the holy sacrifice, and sanctifying the day of the Lord and the feasts of the Church, till, like the centenarian whom the Marquis of Worcester found during the Civil War, who had clung for eighty years to the true faith, when all around her were disloyal, but to whom the tidings that Mass was still said, and that she should be taken to a castle where she might hear it daily, was too much for her enfeebled frame. She died for joy that she was to hear Mass once more, to kneel in adoration at the solemn moment of consecration.

The Catholics of the British Isles, after the reform of Pope Urban VIII., kept as obligatory : Christmas, the feasts of St. Stephen, St. John, Holy Innocents and St. Sylvester, Circumcision, Epiphany, Candlemas, the feasts of St. Mathias and St. Joseph, Annunciation, Sts. Philip and James, Finding of the Holy Cross, St. John the Baptist, Sts. Peter and Paul, St. James, St. Anne, St. Lawrence, the Assumption, St. Bartholomew, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, St. Matthew, St. Michael, Sts. Simon and Jude, All Saints, St. Andrew, and St. Thomas, and one of the principal patrons of the city, province, or kingdom. These were the holydays of obligation observed by the Catholics in Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania. But there, as in the British Isles, the observance of the law of the Church was not always an easy matter even for the most zealous. Where priests were so few and Mass often had to be said by stealth, few could actually hear Mass every holyday of obligation. In many cases private devotions at home were the only possible substitute by which they could attend in spirit the holy sacrifice offered on the altar of the Church. The numbers of Catholics who were held as bond servants of Protestants could not well escape working on those days. As some worked from necessity, others more careless and less scrupulous assumed the liberty of doing so likewise, though without justifiable reasons.

To remedy this, the Superior of the Mission, in 1722, laid the matter before the Confessor of the Faith, Bonaventure Giffard, Vicar Apostolic of London. The document premises that some step was necessary, as many Catholics took the liberty to work generally on holydays, because it was lawful in some cases of

necessity. As this was very disedifying, and might prove a great scandal to the more timorous, whose consciences would not allow them the same liberty, the bishop permitted hands to be employed where necessary in getting in crops on holydays occurring between May 1st and September 30th, except, however, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, and Assumption, on which servile work was forbidden. All others not employed in getting in crops, were to observe all holydays by refraining from servile work, and all were required to hear Mass on every feast day of obligation. (Bishop Giffard's Regulation, December 21st, 1722).

These holydays thus regulated were observed by the oppressed Catholics of Maryland during the last century, when, in return for the liberty of worship they sought to establish, they were compelled to support a Protestant clergy, were excluded from office, deprived of the franchise, and loaded with double taxes.

At length, however, the Sovereign Pontiff, in view of the continuance of the persecuting spirit in England and America, for a cessation of which no prospect appeared, resolved to reduce the number of holydays of obligation there as elsewhere. Pius VI. accordingly, on the 9th of March, 1777, dispensed all Catholics in the kingdom of Great Britain from the precept of hearing Mass, and abstaining from servile works on all holydays except the Sundays of the year, the feasts of Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Easter Monday, Ascension, Whitsun-Monday, Corpus Christi, St. Peter and St. Paul, Assumption, and All Saints.

These were the holydays of obligation at the time of the erection of this portion of the London vicariate into the diocese of Baltimore. The fasting days were the Ember days, the forty days of Lent, Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent, and the vigils of Christmas, Whitsun-Sunday, Sts. Peter and Paul, and All Saints.

There is nothing in the first Synod of Baltimore, held in 1791 by Bishop Carroll, promulgating these as the feasts and fasts of obligation in his diocese, which embraced the United States. The Indians in Maine and northern New York, and the Catholics in the territory northwest of the Ohio, had been under the See of Quebec, and the question was raised whether the diocese of Baltimore included the thirteen States, or all the territory recognized by other nations, as belonging to the government known as the United States. The Holy See decided that the diocese had the same limits as the national territory, but, in point of fact, Detroit and other points in the West were held by England till the signing of Jay's treaty, and the Bishop of Quebec addressed the Catholics of Detroit as part of his flock.

When, however, the jurisdiction of Baltimore was recognized

throughout the country, the holydays and fasts observed in the East seemed to have been adopted in all the West.

Louisiana, with the country west of the Mississippi, which had been part of the diocese of Quebec, was ceded by France to Spain in 1763. About thirteen years subsequently, the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba, who had always regarded Florida as part of his diocese, extended his jurisdiction over Louisiana. There is no trace of any decree at Rome, or at Quebec, by which this was formally detached from the diocese of Quebec, and the Bishop of Santiago de Cuba seems to have acted under the direction of the Spanish court, claiming the territory as the part of ancient Florida traversed by De Soto. At all events, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, feasts and fasts recognized in Cuba and Florida, were observed more or less faithfully in Louisiana, under the Bishops of Cuba, till 1787, when, with Florida, it became part of the new diocese of Louisiana and the Floridas. Bishop Peñalver, the first bishop, made no new regulation that is known, and the feasts and fasts continued unaltered till the commencement of the nineteenth century.

Bonaparte, with Spain humbled before him, felt that the honor of France required the recovery of Louisiana, which, French in origin, French in feeling, had been for years under Spanish domination. In 1801 Spain agreed to cede it upon certain conditions and contingencies. Bonaparte found, however, that England with a fleet in the Gulf of Mexico could at any time wrest it from France. The United States, hampered by Spanish regulations, which denied vessels descending the Mississippi the privilege of obtaining water and provisions, was compelled at last to open negotiations with the First Consul for the territory. Napoleon, seeing that he could not hold Louisiana, was not reluctant to transfer it to a friendly power, who could prevent England from acquiring it. A treaty, signed April 30th, 1803, transferred the colony to the United States. "I can scarcely say that I cede it to them," said Napoleon, "for it is not yet in our possession." The *jus dominii* had thus been twice transferred, though the Spanish flag continued to float over Louisiana, and the colony was still governed by Spanish civil and ecclesiastical law.

By the treaty of April 30th, 1803, France parted with the *jus dominii*, without having ever acquired possession. It remained only for Spain to make the formal delivery to France, that France might transfer it to the United States. "On the 6th of June, 1803, the First Consul had appointed Laussat, commissioner on the part of France, to receive possession of the province of Louisiana, and deliver it to the commissioners to be appointed on behalf of the United States. On the 30th of November the keys of New Orleans

were handed to Laussat, who was put in possession of Louisiana and its dependencies. On the 20th of December Laussat proclaimed the delivery of the province to the United States and handed the keys of the city of New Orleans to Clayborne, the commissioner of the United States.

Now the reader may wonder what all this has to do with the feasts and fasts of the Catholic Church, and he may think that, if

Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus,

the writer, over-given to historical disquisition, has let his mind go wool-gathering, and that he has actually forgotten the subject which he set out to discuss. Yet it all has a bearing, and was necessary to explain a curious question that arose, or, rather, a course of action adopted without question.

On the 5th of April, 1802, a Concordat was signed between Napoleon Bonaparte, First Consul of France, and Pope Pius VII., by one of the provisions of which the holydays of obligation to be observed in France were reduced to Christmas, Ascension, Assumption, and All Saints. In France the Revolution had swept away all ecclesiastical and religious institutions, and Bonaparte was afraid of venturing too far, or of asking the infidel party to accept too much. Yet it was held in Louisiana that the temporary tenure of the province by France for twenty days, without any *jus domini*, but merely to effect a formal transfer to the United States, brought Louisiana, where religion had suffered nothing from the revolutionary spirit of France, within the action of the Concordat and the Organic Articles published by Bonaparte with it. The ground seems utterly untenable. Bonaparte never seems to have regarded it so. He made no nomination to the vacant bishopric of Louisiana, as he might have done under the Concordat, had he deemed it to apply; none of the rights of the Church or of the Ursuline Convent were at all invaded under color of French law from the Spanish cession of 1801 to 1803. Yet untenable as the proposition seems to have been legally, it is nevertheless certain that from that time no holydays of obligation except those four were observed in Louisiana, which then embraced all the territory west of the Mississippi, and in which in time were formed the dioceses of St. Louis, Little Rock, Dubuque, St. Paul, Natchitoches, Kansas City, St. Joseph, Davenport, Leavenworth, Omaha, and several vicariates.

The case was, apparently, not referred to Rome for any decision or opinion, for Cardinal Litta wrote to Archbishop Marechal on the 11th of July, 1818, to ascertain on what ground the faithful in Louisiana did not observe fast days that were of obligation in other

parts of the United States. It is stated, however, in the statutes of the Diocese of St. Louis, set forth by Bishop Rosati, in 1839, that the reduction of the holydays was then established by a concession of the Holy See, and it was enjoined to celebrate with solemnity the feasts of the Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Corpus Christi, Sts. Peter and Paul, the Nativity and Conception of the Blessed Virgin, as well as Easter Monday and Whitsun-Monday. (Statute 1839, p. 20; Roman edn., p. 183.)

By a still stranger course of reasoning, this Concordat was assumed by some, who must have been very ill-informed on American history, to extend to the territory, now the States, of Mississippi, Indiana, and Illinois. This territory, east of the Mississippi River, had been in the hands of England from 1763 to 1776, and of the United States after that, except the southern part of the present State of Mississippi, which was embraced in the Spanish province of West Florida. None of these parts were in Louisiana as transferred by Spain to France, and by France to the United States. With the exception of a small Spanish strip, it had been under the English and American flags for forty years, and could not in the remotest degree be affected by a Concordat between the First Consul of France, or the Emperor of China, and the Pope. Yet in some mysterious way this Concordat was considered to affect territory of the United States, to which France under Louis XVI., the Terror, the Republic and the Consulate, had not made the slightest claim or pretence. However, these holydays only were kept in the dioceses of Chicago, Vincennes,¹ and Mobile.

When Florida was purchased in 1821, no such question arose. The old holydays were maintained. The same was the case in Texas on its annexation, and in the territory acquired by the United States after the Mexican war.²

But the due observance of holydays, whether few or many, was a subject of concern. The Synod of 1791 says: "Catholics, especially tradesfolk and artisans of every kind, who live in towns, cannot, without great inconvenience, abstain from selling goods or work on those holydays which are not observed also by Protestants. Whence there is reason to fear that if this is rigorously exacted,

¹ They were kept in Indiana during the administration of Bishop de la Hailandiere, who so established them in a synod (Syn. Vincenn., I., 1844), but the former usage of celebrating the other feasts has since been observed, the Holy See having, at the request of the Second Council of Cincinnati, issued a rescript making the Circumcision, Epiphany, Corpus Christi and Annunciation of obligation. (Conc. Cincin., II., p. 18.)

² The feasts of obligation in New Mexico, as fixed by the *Constituciones Ecclesiasticas de Santa Fé*, 1874, p. 29, were the Sundays, Circumcision, Epiphany, Annunciation, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Assumption, All Saints, Immaculate Conception, and Christmas.

there will be some who will imperil their eternal salvation rather than incur such temporal losses. To meet this difficulty, therefore, we ordain that every one should consult his pastor and abide by his judgment in the matter. And we warn our venerable brethren that when grave cause exists, they may dispense with their observance of the holydays, retaining, however, the obligation to hear Mass, if more than one is said in the place where the dispensation is given, or if they can hear that one without serious loss." (Synodus Baltimore, ann. 1791, § 20.)

The history of the various holydays observed as of obligation in the different parts of the country at different times is not without a degree of interest. When a work appeared which professed to treat *ex professo* of the ecclesiastical law in the United States, the writer not unnaturally looked for a full and clear treatment of that subject, as well as of tithes, in that work. Of tithes nothing was said; of the holydays of obligation a few words, and not extremely accurate, drawn from the common Catholic annual directory, seemed to exhaust the subject; but a more extended use of the work resulted in the conviction that it was merely a translation of a French work, entirely dispensing with a study of what had been regarded as ecclesiastical law in the three great divisions of the country in earlier times.¹

At the time of the first Plenary Council of Baltimore, the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide urged that the feast of the Circumcision should be made of obligation throughout the country, and the feast of the Immaculate Conception, which had been adopted as the patronal feast of the United States, should be made of obligation.²

The first Provincial Council of New Orleans manifested a reluctance to attempt to enforce these (Conc. Neo. Aurel, I., p. 20), and the Holy See was urged to permit the obligation of hearing Mass and resting from servile works to be restricted to the four great feasts. The Sovereign Pontiff, however, through Cardinal Barnabo, in 1816, exhorted the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council not to seek uniformity in points where relaxed discipline had removed the practice in the American dioceses far from the usual and general discipline of the Church, but to endeavor to lead

¹ Additional probability is given to the supposition, from the fact that the author of the work in question appropriated, and issued as his own, a compilation prepared by the present writer. If this article is taken, as one on the Douay Bible was taken by a seminary professor, it is to be hoped that it will be more thoroughly revised than his work in the other cases.

² Pittsburg (Dioc. Syn., 1844) and Sault St. Mary, in the Statuta Diœc. Marianap., 1872, p. 7, urged all the faithful to sanctify this feast by hearing Mass; and the V. Syn. Philadel. directed that a novena or triduum should precede the feast.

the faithful gradually back from the relaxed discipline to the paths of that generally observed.

In the Second Plenary Council (1866) the feast of the Immaculate Conception was made of obligation,¹ as it had been in Oregon (I Concil. Oregon, 1848), where the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul had retained its place with the Monday after Easter and Whit-Sunday, St. John the Baptist, Candlemas, and St. Stephen.

Pope Gregory XVI., in 1837, dispensed all the dioceses then in the United States from the obligation as to Easter Monday and Whitsun-Monday, and in 1840 from that of the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul; and the same Sovereign Pontiff relieved the faithful from the fast on Wednesdays in Advent. (III. Concil. Prov. Balt., pp. 148, 150, 187.)

This was the position of the discipline in this country when the Third Penary Council was convened. The effort to induce the faithful to a more exact observance of holydays of obligation, or at least so far as hearing mass was concerned, had not been successful. A general indifference prevailed. When zealous priests, to give servants and mechanics every opportunity to fulfil the obligation, had Mass celebrated at an early hour, to permit them to attend it before proceeding to their usual work, it was found that almost the only persons to avail themselves of the opportunity would be a few pious old women, while those of the very class for whose benefit the Mass was thus offered were scarcely represented by a few straggling individuals.

The Fathers of the Council renewed their petition to the Holy See, and His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII., on the 31st of December, 1885, transferred the solemnization of Corpus Christi to the Sunday following the feast, and made the holydays of obligation in all parts of the United States to be thenceforward: The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Christmas Day, the feast of the Circumcision, Ascension Day, the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, and the feast of All Saints. (III. Conc. Balt. Plen., pp. cvi., 57.)

Thus, for the first time, a uniform discipline prevails throughout the United States; Louisiana and the dioceses formed from it adopted the feasts of the Circumcision and the Immaculate Conception; New Mexico, California, and Oregon, and the rest of the United States, no longer are bound by the obligation to hear Mass and abstain from servile works on the Epiphany, the Annunciation, and Corpus Christi.

Thus gradually the original scheme of the Church has been swept away by increasing tepidity. The feasts of the Apostles are

¹ The holydays as then appointed are given formally in *Acta Dioc. Roffensis*, p. 26; *Constit. Dioc. Boston*, 1868, p. 21.

gone, the many feasts of our Lord are reduced to three, of our Lady to two, and of the Saints the one single festival of All Saints remains.

There was a time when the holydays of the Church were the godsend of the poor toilers for bread; a time when the churches of the living God were lived in by the poor, to whom they were homes, houses of prayer, galleries of art, incentives to devotion. Time, in the sense of the Church, is a respite, a reprieve given to men to save their souls; time, in the sense of the modern world, is a term when the many are to labor to enrich the few; a term so precious that none of it can be spared for the many to save their souls.

The long line of festivals has been suppressed. Who has gained by it? The French Revolution seized and used all the property of the Church and the nobles. The poor were to be raised from their abject misery. By work and toil they were to acquire competence. After a century of trial the working class in France are desperate anarchists, clamoring again for a seizure of property from those who hold it. Spain seized the Church property, and has its discontented thousands; Italy did the same, and drives her people into exile as immigrants to foreign lands. The gospel of work is now rejected by the poor. They have had too much of it. They clamor for fewer hours of work, for more holydays, for higher wages. The time and money they extort by combinations, have no blessing; both are spent in sensual indulgence. Their families do not gain by them, but saloon-keepers are enriched.

These extorted holydays given by the nineteenth century do nothing to elevate or improve the masses. As a mere matter of political economy, it may be asked whether the old time Catholic worker, who had twenty religious holydays, and spent much of them in ennobling and piety-inspiring shrines, was not happier in himself, more prosperous in his home, a more valuable element in the body politic, than his modern representative?

DESCARTES' POSTULATE OF EXISTENCE.

AT the very beginning of philosophical reasoning we are met by the impossibility of finding in a single formal expression any statement that does not beg the question of existence. The basis, in order to satisfy even the skeptic, must evidently not only not beg, through its terms, the question involved, but must not, to the mass of mankind, seem to beg it. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of the task dawns at the first glance, even from the preceding brief remark, made without intention of attempting in that connection to define a criterion such as would form a basis for reasoning. For if we say, as above, "evidently," we directly assert that there is such a thing as conclusive evidence. We thereby assume the existence of a fundamental criterion or of fundamental criteria; for the at least assumed existence of such criterion or criteria is necessary to the formal validity of any evidence whatever, and to the establishment of any position however near or remote.

The existence of such a criterion or of such criteria was, therefore, begged here in a statement intended solely to introduce the discussion of the question of the possibility of defining in set terms the humanly fundamental fact—existence. It is unavoidable, however, that in the approach to this or any other subject, the question of the existence of such criteria should be begged. Otherwise, we could not reach consideration of any subject at all. It is an unavoidable case of *ὕστερον πρότερον*. But, having once reached a subject, not fundamental, through a preliminary artifice which has placed us face to face with it, the artifice is not either retained or discarded; it simply lapses, perforce of its having no immediately intimate relation to the subject. Otherwise, if, for example, we demanded formal ratiocinative evidence of existence, the conduct of life would be impossible. For the daily needs of life we must assume existence as proved; not as provable, but as a certainty beyond all formal proof.

That we reach the entrance to many truths through fictions of our own creation and fashioning, it is hardly worth while to pause long in order to demonstrate. John Stuart Mill, in opposition to Whewell, has contended that the definitions and the axioms of geometry are derived, not from intuitions, but from experience; both being, for the purpose for which they are designed, ideally

amplified through divestment of non-essentials.¹ A line, for example, which, mathematically, is said to have length without breadth or thickness, is nothing but the line of our experience, having length, breadth, and thickness; but, by a fiction, to the truth of which we formally assent, for the sake of reaching a basis for the discovery of mathematical truth, it is mentally, although not conceivably, divested of characteristics non-essential to the purpose in view. Mill's demonstration regarding axioms, although properly long and elaborate, would be lengthy here, and therefore must be passed by without illustration, which, without the demonstration, would not be comprehensible. Perhaps the most correct statement would be that these conceptions are given in intuition, mediately through experience. It may well be questioned whether they are purely intuitive or purely experiential. To affirm of them that they are mixed in their derivation is, however, merely to say that they are given in a teaching of experience appreciable through the constitution of the mind. Being at once apprehended, they give the impression of being purely intuitive, when, probably, experience is a necessary factor to their determination. Certain it is that not until emergence from the child characteristics of mind, a variable point of time in human development, is there appreciation of what is regarded as their axiomatic truth; which would seem to substantiate the view here expressed.

That there are fundamental criteria upon which the validity of reasoning must rest, is the conviction of the mass of mankind. They find themselves, and see all men, conducting themselves as if in assured possession of criteria for forming judgments. It follows that whatever men may use for the ordinary needs of life must, in reference to their constitution, be based on fundamental criteria that collectively embrace the whole of life. Moreover, it is the conviction of the great majority of that portion of mankind which philosophizes, that there are various criteria, resolvable into one fundamental criterion; that whoever says one criterion, says God. Among these criteria is the generally admitted principle of contradiction, which affirms that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. There are other principles, but it would lead us far, and entirely away from our purpose, to enter upon discussion of them here. The demonstration to be here made relates solely to the assertion that fundamental criteria are formally inexpressible without begging the question; in proof whereof it will be shown that the question of existence itself cannot, without begging it, be formally stated. If it, itself, cannot, without begging the question, be formally stated, it cannot form

¹ Chapter V. of J. S. Mill's *Logic*, Eighth Edition. Harper & Brother, New York City.

other than an assumed basis for the establishment of any question within the confines of existence as at present generally and practically believed to exist.

Even with regard to the principle of contradiction, which to the mass of mankind seems indisputable, the skeptic might not be at a loss for a reply. He might say that the formulation of the principle begs the question of our own existence; for we have not proved that we exist, as the mere unaided, unreasoning sense of existence tells us that we exist. This being true, it would be easy for him to proceed a step further, and say that, if we cannot prove that even we ourselves exist, we cannot know it, and therefore cannot be justified in asserting that it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be at the same time. What shall we think? Only that, as pure negation is the easiest wisdom in the trifles of life, it cannot fail to be the most impregnable in what concerns the very essence of life. But, how should we answer the skeptic? There is no answer derivable from the expression of a single ratiocinative principle. That is what we are about to essay to prove. We are forced, according to our conviction, to admit that the affirmation of any principle of existence begs the question of existence; that no formal expression relating to it can be devised without begging the question of existence. Therefore, if this be true, the most fundamental of all human postulates, whether expressed or implied, begs existence; as, without begging the question of existence, we cannot define it, we cannot base upon it any criterion without equally begging the question. This is not, as already intimated, to assert that existence is necessarily indefinable. Millions of human beings now living, and many more millions who have passed away, have mentally defined it, and have lived in the certainty of its correct definition. Wherein, then, lies the impossibility of defining it in the set terms of a single expression? It lies in the fact that it is, in the intellectual order, beyond any set terms of speech. Speech, even in its highest range, is the medium of the commonplace, compared with thought to be expressed that is the middle term between God and man. Even the human mind, incomparably superior in conception to its power of expression by speech, is only the portal through which we penetrate to, but not into, the temple wherein is enshrined the mystery of mysteries.

The subject before us, at present, concerns strictly the possibility of making any formal proposition regarding existence that does not either beg, or seem to the mass of mankind to beg, the question involved. We might assume, hypothetically, that a proposition might be framed which does not beg the question, and yet, which would seem to mankind generally to beg it. In that case, the fact of the proposition not begging the question would depend

upon the relative intelligence of a small minority. Effectively, if, to the general lower intelligence, the question seemed to be begged, it would be begged. The problem, therefore, set before the dialectician, in attempting to formulate in language this fundamental postulate of reasoning, is, as has been said, so to phrase it that it shall not seem to mankind generally to beg it. There is no lesser test that would make sure that it has been correctly framed. Attempting the solution of this problem, he will have set before himself an impossible task; for neither it, nor, in consequence, any other proposition can, without begging the question of existence, be formulated, either for mankind generally, or for the choicest band of philosophers.

Here, in this case, no artifice is possible to enable us to place ourselves upon a foundation as the very first indispensable condition to making a step in advance. The question is not of what we individually believe to be true, but of what we shall stand ready to prove to others to be true. Back of that, of course, necessarily, the question is of what we shall stand ready to prove to ourselves. Our own personal belief being what it is,—in the value of certain cognitions from intuition, and in one fundamental truth, God,—we are yet forced to confess to ourselves that belief in human existence is not, without begging the question, statable in one formal proposition, or in any number of formal propositions. Although, of the existence of fundamental criteria, derived from one primeval criterion, we are incidentally endeavoring to express our firm conviction, we are not, however, directing special attention to our own conviction, or to the processes by which it has been reached, but are speaking to the point of the possibility of so defining fundamental criteria that their truth shall be universally recognized by intelligent men. There is no possibility of it. Referring to one primeval criterion, its existence is disputed. Referring to existence, its existence is disputed. These we may affirm to exist, but how shall we prove them to exist? Only by the formulation of a proposition which shall not beg the question involved. That proposition we cannot formulate, and, therefore, these propositions are insusceptible of proof of the ratiocinative kind contained in language. It does not follow that they are insusceptible of comprehension of the mental kind, apart from the formal propositions of language.

How can we possibly frame in language any proposition upon the truth of which all human criteria, if such exist, must rest, when there are men who doubt the existence of existence? We have, logically, no more right to say, "I think, therefore I exist," than we have the right to say, "I exist, therefore I think." If one say, with Descartes, "I think, therefore I am," the answer is ready, that

the affirmation of the "I think" is assuming existence to exist, the thing to be proved. If so, and we must admit that it is so, then the statement is, "the existence thinks, therefore exists." But, if existence be assumed, there is no necessity for the predication, "thinks." It has no relevancy as a factor towards the conclusion; which is simply the statement that existence exists, which is not fruitful; for, evidently, existence exists, if it exists, and does not exist, if it does not exist. Descartes has defended his proposition, but examination of the passages wherein he has attempted to justify it will prove, we think, that he has not done so triumphantly.¹

Kant says: "I should have a reasonable hope of putting an end forever to this sophistical mode of argumentation, by a strict definition of the conception of existence, did not my own experience teach me that the illusion arising from our confounding a logical with a real predicate (a predicate which aids in the determination of a thing) resists almost all the endeavors of explanation and illustration. A *logical predicate* may be what you please, even the subject may be predicated of itself; for logic pays no regard to the contents of a judgment. But the determination of a conception is a predicate, which adds to and enlarges the conception. It must not, therefore, be contained in the conception."²

The principle of Descartes has been often assailed. The latest denial of its truth with which we have met is that of Dr. Henry Maudsley, who, although speaking from the lowest depth of pessimism, and presenting the strange spectacle of an accomplished metaphysician ridiculing metaphysics, without which he could not write at all on the topics of which he habitually treats, is, nevertheless, an unusually able, philosophical, and even powerful writer.³ He says: "*Cogito, ergo sum*, 'I think, therefore I am,' has a ring of transcendental authority, until we interpolate after 'I' the quietly suppressed, but none the less surreptitiously understood, 'who am,' and let it read, as it should read, thus,—'I [who am] think, there-

¹ Renati Des Cartes ad C. L. R. Epistola: In qua ad epitomen præcipuarum Petri Gassendi, Instantiarum respondetur. Meditationes de Prima Philosophia, cum Responsibus Auctoris. Editio ultima prioribus auctor et emendatio. Amstelodami. Apud Danielelem Elsavirium. MDCLXXVIII.

² Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, pp. 367 and 368. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

³ Yet, although anomalous, this intellectual phase is not only not unprecedented, but is not uncommon, as we learn from Kant, who says with respect to it: "For it is in reality vain to profess *indifference* in regard to such inquiries, the object of which cannot be indifferent to humanity. Besides, these pretended *indifferentists*, however much they may try to disguise themselves by the assumption of a popular style, and by changes on the language of the schools, unavoidably fall into metaphysical declarations and propositions, which they profess to regard with so much contempt." Page second of the Preface to the first edition of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

fore I am;' after which it does not appear to carry us beyond the simple and subjectively irreducible fact of consciousness, beneath which, it must not be forgotten, there is in all cases the more fundamental fact of an organism that is *one*.¹

Is Dr. Maudsley right? We think that he is, so far as exhibiting the imperfection of the principle as attempted to be formulated. It seems extraordinary that any one could ever have disputed the correctness of the position he assumes. But, as stated before, our contention is that it is only the formulation that is defective; that the defect is inherent, not in the truth attempted to be formulated, but in the formulation of it.

Let us approach the subject gradually, with a torch lent us by one of the most subtle thinkers of modern times, the Spanish writer, Balmez. He says, in discussing this principle of Descartes: "The famous principle of Descartes, 'I think, therefore I am,' has been often attacked, and justly and conclusively so, if this philosopher really understood his principle in the sense which the schools are accustomed to give it. If Descartes presented it as a true argument, as an enthymema, with an antecedent and a consequent, the argument was clearly defective in its foundation. For, when he said, 'I am going to prove my existence with this enthymema, I think, therefore I am,' the objection might have been made: your enthymema is equivalent to a syllogism in this form: 'whatever thinks, exists; but I think, therefore I exist.' This syllogism, in the supposition of universal doubt, excluding even the supposition of existence itself, is inadmissible in its propositions and in their connection. In the first place, how do you know that whatever thinks exists? Because [you answer] nothing can think without existing. How do you know that? Because [you say] what does not exist, does not act. But how, in its turn, do you know this? Supposing every thing to be doubted, nothing to be known, these principles are not known; otherwise we fall short of the supposition of universal doubt, and consequently go out of the question. If any one of these principles must be admitted without proof, it is just as well to admit your own existence and save yourself the trouble of proving it with an enthymema.

"In the second place, how do you know that you think? Your argument may be retorted, as dialecticians say, in the following manner: 'Nothing can think without existing; but your existence is doubtful, for you are trying to prove it; therefore you are not sure that you think.'

"Manifestly, then, Descartes' principle, taken as a true argument, cannot be defended; and it is so easy to see the defect that it

¹ Body and Will, by Henry Maudsley, M.D., page 37. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., No. 1 Paternoster Square, London.

seems impossible for so clear and penetrating an intellect to have overlooked it. It is, therefore, probable that Descartes understood his principle in a very different sense; and we will now briefly show what meaning, in our judgment, the illustrious philosopher must have given to it.

"Supposing himself for a moment in universal doubt, without accepting for certain anything that is known, he concentrated himself on himself, and in the depth of his soul sought a point whereon to base the edifice of human cognitions. Although we abstract all around us, we clearly cannot abstract ourselves, our mind, which is present to our own eyes, only the more lucidly the greater the abstraction in which we place ourselves with respect to external objects. Now, in this concentration, this collection of himself within himself, this withdrawal from everything, for fear of error, and asking himself if there be anything certain, if there be any foundation and starting-point in the career of knowledge; first of all is presented to him the consciousness of thought, the very presence of the acts of his mind. If we mistake not, this was Descartes' thought: 'I wish to doubt of everything; I refrain from affirming as from denying anything; I isolate myself from whatever surrounds me, because I know not if it be anything more than an illusion. But, in this very isolation, I meet with the intimate sense of my internal acts, with the presence of my mind; *I think, therefore I am*; this I feel in a manner that leaves no room for doubt or uncertainty; *therefore I am*; that is to say, this sense of my thought makes me know my existence.'

"This explains why Descartes did not present his principle as a mere enthymema, as an ordinary argument, but as determining a fact presented to him, and first in the order of facts; even if he inferred existence from thought, it was not by deduction, properly so called, but as one fact contained in another, or rather identified with it.

"We say *identified*, because it really is so in Descartes' opinion; and this confirms what we have already advanced, that this philosopher did not offer an argument, but laid down a fact. According to him, the essence of the soul consists in thought; and as other schools of philosophy distinguish between substance and its acts, considering the mind in the first class, and thought in the second, so Descartes held that there was no distinction between mind and thought, that they were the same thing, that thought constituted the essence of the soul. 'Although one attribute,' he says, 'suffices to make us know the substance, there is, nevertheless, in every substance one attribute, which constitutes its nature and essence, and on which all the others depend. Extension in length, breadth, and thickness constitutes the essence of corporeal substance; and

thought constitutes the nature of the substance which thinks.' From this it follows that Descartes, in laying down the principle, 'I think, therefore I exist,' only declared a fact attested by consciousness; and so simple did he consider it, and so unique, that in evolving his system, he identified thought with the soul, and its essence with its existence. He was conscious of thought, and said: 'This thought is my soul; I am.'"¹

Thus speaks Balmez, whom we have quoted at length, lest a partial quotation might do injustice to his exposition. We cannot see how he has in the least mended matters by his final enunciation of the principle; what he has, in our opinion, accomplished, we will presently describe. If the idea of Descartes was really as interpreted by Balmez, it was nothing, as to fact and expression, but that common to all men. It merely assumes what, at first, all men naturally assume as truth through intuition, through self-consciousness; the correctness of which no one can formally prove or disprove.

Speaking now solely with reference to the formulation of Descartes' idea by Balmez, according to his interpretation of it, "this thought is my soul; I am;" we would say that, in our opinion, there is no avoidance of begging the question. "This thought is," says Balmez. What thought? Really Descartes' thought; and therefore the expression is equivalent to, "I [Descartes] think." What remains is only "I am;" for Balmez has told us what, in fact, is so, that Descartes held thought and soul to be one. The analysis, therefore, stands thus: "I [Descartes] think; I am." That reduces the expression to exactly what it was before, according to Descartes, because the word "therefore" is grammatically understood. This, then, is Balmez' complete expression, as analyzed, exhibiting the fact that he does not, any more than Descartes, avoid begging the question: "This thought is my soul [I think]; [therefore] I am."

Dr. Maudsley² might say, for he has said in his work, "Body and Will," that "it has never yet been shown, though it is freely assumed, that consciousness is not the function of a particular bodily structure." Neither, we may say in reply, has it yet been proved that consciousness *is* the function of a particular bodily structure, although it is in a fair way to be at length acknowledged as assumed by a certain school of physiologists, that it is naught but that. We can afford to leave Dr. Maudsley's statement out of

¹ Chapter XVII., pp. 108, 109, 110 of *Fundamental Philosophy*, by James Balmez. Translated from the Spanish by Henry F. Brownson, M.A. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., No. 31 Barclay Street, New York City.

² *Body and Will*, by Henry Maudsley, M.D., page 38. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. No. 1 Paternoster Square, London.

consideration, inasmuch as this discussion is proceeding on lines of implication incompatible with its formal introduction at this point. As to his objection, it is well, however, to note here, in passing, that it doubly begs the question of existence, by implying existence as material.

To sum up what Balmez seems to us to say: He begins by asserting that, according to his view, the expression by Descartes of his principle was probably at variance with his conception of it; that, whereas, he evidently intended to enunciate his principle as the expression of a fact, he had given to it the form of an argument. Taking this as his point of departure, Balmez then defines what he thinks Descartes intended to enunciate. But, in so doing, he gives nothing, as the idea of Descartes, beyond what is the common conception and expression of the commonly accepted cognition as derived from intuition; and besides, in attempting to state it as a fact, to the avoidance of its appearance as an argument, he has presented, as to form, an argument exactly like that of Descartes, only couched in different words; for it ought to be evident that the expression of Balmez, "this thought is my soul, I am," is equivalent to the expression of Descartes, "I think, therefore I am." Both have the form of arguments. Both, if to be interpreted as statement of fact, not argument, do not go beyond the general expression of the general cognition through intuition.

It is a strange thing to say, and we wish to say it without the slightest intention of disparaging Balmez, for whom we have the sincerest admiration, that in this particular case he has, while elaborately attempting to elucidate the view of Descartes, as formulated in his celebrated proposition, failed in a measure to relieve it from its original obscurity. And this is all the more strange because, in a mere note which he appends to his "Fundamental Philosophy" he gives, from Descartes himself, the only explanation, of all that he made of which we know, that is satisfactory. In support of this statement we quote from the notes to book first of "Fundamental Philosophy," as translated by Mr. Henry F. Brownson, the following passage.

"We have, we think, faithfully interpreted the thought of Descartes, but lest there should be some doubt as to this, we subjoin a notable passage from his answer to the objections collected by Père Mersenne from various philosophers and theologians, against the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth meditations.

"When we know that we are something that thinks, this first notion *is taken from no syllogisms*; and when any one says: *I think, therefore I am*, or exist, *he does not infer* his existence from thought, as *by the force of a syllogism*, but as a thing known by itself; *he sees it by a simple inspection of the mind*; for if he deduced it from a syl-

logism, he would have to know beforehand this major: whatever thinks is, or exists. On the contrary, this proposition is manifested to him by his own sentiment that he cannot think without existing. It is a property characteristic of our mind to form general propositions from the knowledge of particular propositions.' Descartes does not always explain himself with this clearness; the objections of his adversaries made him examine his doctrine more thoroughly, and this contributed to clear up his ideas."

But then, this comes to what we have from the first asserted, that no proposition can be framed which shall prove the fact of existence. Here Descartes impliedly admits it, for he shows that what bears the form of an argument—the very framework of his celebrated proposition—is no argument at all, that it was not by him intended, and cannot properly be understood, as such. Here, as Descartes admits it, we rest our case with this conclusion, in which we have the honor to agree with both him and Balmez, that it is impossible to make an argument for, without begging the question of, existence; which is what was to be demonstrated.

It is not intended as disparagement of the judgment of mankind as to the principle attempted to be enunciated by Descartes and Balmez, to say that the principle does not, through their enunciation, rise above the common conception and expression of the principle by mankind generally. It is safe to say, what has all along been here implied, what it would be madness to doubt, that the understanding, through perception or imperception, of the intelligent of mankind generally, must be the final test of the truth of any principle whatsoever, and that equally (as inseparably bound up with their perception or imperception) to that test must be the final appeal as to the correctness or incorrectness of the formulation of the principle with respect to its representation in words. Philosophers cannot in any wise go beyond the perception of the intelligent of mankind generally, in the comprehension of a principle that relates to mankind, or in the perception of the truth or falsity of the principle as formulated in words. It is only in the sphere of the first conception and formulation of principles that philosophers can excel the intelligent of mankind generally. The final test of the truth of the principles, and of their correct expression, must reside with mankind. Assuming this position as incontrovertible, then we repeat that neither Descartes nor Balmez has formulated the principle evidently intended to be formulated, in a manner essentially different from each other, or from that in which it is formulated by the intelligent of mankind generally.

Yet, withal, there is a something indefinable in the expression of Balmez, not contained in the expression of Descartes, which, as an attempted statement of what it is obvious that each attempts to

state, approaches much more nearly to the truth of statement, as such, without regard to whether the thing attempted to be stated be or be not true, than the expression of Descartes comes. But more, far more, than from the expression into which Balmez finally resolves the conception (which, formally, is as faulty as that of Descartes) does light break upon us from the exposition of both in the expansion of their theme; which both have marred by their attempted condensation of it in a single phrase.

It does not follow that, if the principle of Descartes and Balmez, assuming it to exist, could be enunciated without begging the question of existence, it would, while substantially in its present form, command general assent, for it must not be forgotten that a certain school tells us that consciousness may be entirely a bodily function,—that is, not spirit. This implies that spirit, if it exists, may not be able to recognize its own essence, and, therefore, that spirit is perhaps non-existent. The objection we note in passing, as an insuperable barrier of negation, and should like to proceed with the heretofore continuous assumption that, if human life means any endowment, it means endowment of spirit. It comes to this, however, that if we would not attempt to formulate an expression that would be taken exception to by the materialist, as begging the question of spirit as well as of existence, we must (provisory, at least, and under protest) substitute for spirit consciousness, which even the materialist does not deny. It will not do, then, to say with Balmez, “this thought is my soul, I am;” we are driven to say, “this self-consciousness is this self-existence,” and “this consciousness of mankind is the existence of mankind;” for this, which is true of one man, is true of all men, as they have ascertained by comparison of individual consciousnesses. Therefore, broadly, for all mankind, consciousness is existence. These are irrefutable propositions. Even the materialist, as stated above, recognizes the fact of consciousness. It affirms and establishes, through individual consciousness, and through comparison with other consciousnesses, not only the fact of its existence, but the quality of its existence, in universal similar consciousness. If it does undeniably affirm the general fact of its existence, why is not what it affirms of the attributes of its existence equally undeniable? This, however, in passing. Admit that consciousness is an unknown quantity, or, rather, quality. Then this unknown quality is existence. Self-consciousness pervades even sleep. With the end of self-consciousness is generally a blank. We beg no question, then, when we say that human consciousness is human existence, whatever consciousness may be, and whatever existence may be.

The difficulty under which we all labor as to the fullest comprehension of the principle under discussion, is in the seemingly im-

possible elimination of the determining *ego* from our knowledge. Descartes includes the *ego*, at least formally, when he says: "I think; therefore I am." Balmez includes it, at least formally, when he uses the expression, "this thought," in the phrase, "this thought is my soul; I am." All mankind formally include it, and must continue formally to include it, whenever they attempt to enunciate the principle of Descartes.

The question, however, arises, whether the *ego* may not at times be eliminated from self-consciousness, as an influence controlling to wrong conclusions. To put it concretely, the question arises whether many of mankind, knowing the *ego* to be at most times self-prominent, so to speak, may not incorrectly believe it to be always so present, in the form prejudicial to sound conclusion regarding itself, and may not, therefore, unjustly suspect it of rendering such conclusion at all times impossible.

Supposing that a man were able to divest himself of the idea of the *ego*, to eliminate the *ego* entirely, in the fullest sense of his not knowing of its presence in his conception, and in his deliverance in speech, its presence would still be asserted by other men, and his deliverance be contested. As he could not indicate his conception of existence by any other than some such expression as, "I think," or "my thought," he is always open to the charge of begging, both mentally and verbally, the question attempted to be enunciated in the principle of Descartes.

The question remains (and the remarks of Balmez throw a flood of light in the right direction), whether the *ego*, in the sense of the presence of one's own individuality, as neutralizing a conception involving the affirmation of existence, may not at times be eliminated. Still would remain, however, the impossibility of formally expressing in any present terms of speech the virtual absence of the *ego*.

This consideration leads, as the natural preliminary starting-point, to the investigation and definition of that which we conceive to be the *ego*. Upon close scrutiny it will be found that we apprehend the term as representing two distinct phases of self-consciousness. We understand the term as referring both abstractly and concretely to self-consciousness. We understand the *ego* in the sense opposed to the abstract *non-ego*. We also understand the *ego* in the sense of its individuality, with reference to Brown, Jones, or Robinson.¹

Is it not within the bounds of experience that the abstract *ego*

¹ Kant remarks: "The simple, in abstraction, is very different from the objectively simple; and hence the *ego*, which is simple in the first sense, may, in the second sense, as indicating the soul itself, be a very complex conception, with a very various content. Kant's Critique of Pure Reason, pp. 476, 477. Bohn's Philosophical Library.

is capable of acts different in kind from those of which the concrete *ego* is capable? There is reason to believe that it is. As Brown, Jones, and Robinson, the concrete *ego* is not, for instance, prompted to enter upon and pursue such speculations as these; it is content to know of its identity with Brown, Jones, and Robinson, as contradistinguished from Johnson and Smith. But, from experience, the abstract *ego* may well be supposed to escape the thralldom of mere identity with these persons. The generally acknowledged fact of unconscious cerebration points in the same direction. Still, even granting this to be so, then would remain, as we have said, the impossibility of formally expressing in any present terms of speech the elimination of the *ego* from obstructive judgment as to existence; for present terms of speech not only make suspected, but affirm, its presence in the concrete form.

To the point whence we set out we return, in the conviction that the principle attempted to be formulated by Descartes and Balmez is true, but that it is inexpressible in formal terms. The general exposition of Balmez, and the final explanation of Descartes, are luminous, but their light is almost extinguished when they attempt to put it into a lantern to guide the stumbling footsteps of mankind. Two, the same questions, as from the beginning of this discussion, confront us: first, as to whether the *ego*, as innately incapable of sound judgment regarding existence, can be deemed ever eliminated; and second, as to whether positive formal proof of existence can be given in set ratiocinative terms of speech. The former of these questions is resolvable into the latter; for if the latter be true, the former must be, but not conversely. But the latter, as we have shown, is not possible, and therefore we must revert to the former, to endeavor to show that the *ego*, in the form of the abstract *ego*, effectively eliminates the concrete *ego* as an element possibly neutralizing judgment; and that although the abstract *ego's* idea of existence cannot be formulated in set ratiocinative terms of speech, it may be formulated by discursion. What abstract self-consciousness knows synthetically may perhaps be painfully explained by continuous approximative statement. Yet the polygon, however multiplied as to sides, never becomes the inscribed circle. All that we can hope to do is to contribute, from an exceptional experience, some additional light to the subject.

It is narrated by Sir Humphry Davy that, experimenting with nitrous oxide gas, and succumbing to its influence, he conceived the whole universe resolved into thought. It is not mentioned, that we remember, in the connection, that during the conception he lost the idea of personal identity. He may have been in a condition analogous to dreaming, where his knowledge of his personal

identity (as is always the case in dreams) was blended with other experiences. Under these circumstances his general experience would place itself in the category of dream-thoughts, and would have no particular relevancy to waking phenomena of consciousness. We ourselves had in some respects a similar experience, but in the main, an entirely dissimilar experience from that of Sir Humphry Davy; which experience, although three years have since elapsed, remains at this moment as vivid as when it occurred. Here, under penalty, otherwise, of rendering the account of it ridiculous, we must drop for awhile the editorial "we."

In a brief phase following complete unconsciousness from the inhalation of nitrous oxide gas, I experienced complete restoration of consciousness, with one exception—memory. Momentarily, therefore, I was without knowledge of personal identity. Consciousness, without personal identity, for a brief period (known afterwards through witnesses to have been brief), broke into bright day, penetrated with a vast sense of potentiality, needing only the whereon to become power, brooding with majestic calm and clearness amid void. Subjectivity and objectivity were lost in the inseparable, I—think—exist. Next to the dominant sense described, was what Dr. Carpenter, the physiologist, terms "expectant attention." If it can be said that thought contemplated existence, then, equally, existence may be said to have contemplated thought. They were the same, and into the abstract *ego* both were resolvable. It was both, and they were one, and of other essence there was nothing. Solitarily, in space, I had for a few brief moments, experience that would have proved to me, had I needed proof, that although Descartes could not logically say, "I think, therefore I am;" nor Balmez, "this thought is my soul, I am;" yet, that the principle is true, with a higher truth than any formulary can express. This perception, derived from what I have justly called an exceptional experience, overrides the imperfection of logical forms, grown out of the daily needs of life, and unequal to expressing the sublime truth of existence. I regard as doubly proved, in my own experience, the belief of mankind generally, that the abstract *ego*, knowing that it thinks, knows that it exists as it believes itself to exist. In this experience was no self-consciousness. It would be answering speciously to assert that self-consciousness was present because I myself was present in myself. Philosophically, self can have no existence without its knowledge of the presence of self. I was conscious, not of my individual self, but of thought and existence, one and indivisible. As the effect of the gas passed away, then I myself rose upon my horizon, out of the abstract and greater self. "I think, therefore I exist; I exist, therefore I think,"

are to me convertible propositions, having significance far beyond the petty forms in which the ideas are illogically clothed.

As before indicated, the question remaining with some men would be: Is, or is not, this consciousness, which mankind generally regard as spiritual, solely a bodily function? We cannot prove that it is not solely a bodily function, neither can it be proved that it is. Mankind generally, convinced of the truth of the teaching of intuition, believe it to be spiritual. If consciousness—thought, mind, soul (call it what one will)—be not spiritual, then we do not exist as mankind generally believe that we exist. We have been first of all confronted with expressed doubt as to our existence, and now, if existence be granted, with doubt as to the character of the existence. If the latter doubt, as formulated materialistically, represents truth, then all that has been said here, and all that may be urged in the same direction, falls to the ground.

The conclusion, then, to which we are forced, is that the *ego* and existence—the latter as to very existence, the former as to essence—are thinkable, believable, but not demonstrable. But we may well hold, with mankind generally, that these belong to a higher order of truths than man is capable of testing with ratiocination. Here we must all rest, for we have reached the foundation of reasoning. If we have not in intuition, from self-consciousness,—the consciousness of consciousness,—knowledge of existence, of its essence, of its significance, certain it is that the knowledge can be derived from no source, physiological or psychological, or both, through discursion. Nay, more, if it could be so derived, the result could not be expressed in forms of language as they now exist, because language has not grown by dealing with fundamental thought, but by accepting fundamental thought, and expressing the needs of life upon the assumption of postulates derived from intuition and experience.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAYER.

AS there never was a time when the world found itself without a religion, so there never was a time when prayer was unknown, or when men did not practise it. Prayer is an active element in the religious economy of the world, whatever form religion may assume. Even Comte found a place for it in the machinery of that curious form of religion which is connected with his name, and in which all his positivist disciples worship humanity personified as the only being to which man owes homage. Not less wonderful, it has even the approval of Professor Tyndall, provided, however, that a form of it be devised "in which the heart might express itself without putting the intellect to shame," whatever that means. Presumably he means by it that, whilst prayer, considered as a power in the physical or moral world, is a superstition from which the intellect revolts, it may be useful as a kind of safety-valve by which the feelings of the heart may be poured out, and that this outpouring may have a reactionary influence whereby the heart is purified and the sentiment stirred up. In other words, prayer may be tolerated on the principle on which some parents nowadays send their children to Sunday-school; because, although of course religion is only a fancy, it does "the little ones" good; it keeps them together; it teaches their "little steps of stairs" to be neat and tidy.

This admission of prayer, as something worth retaining in some sense or for some purpose, is but a feeble echo of the voice of humanity coming down to us through all time. It is a want of our nature; a craving that comes out spontaneously from the soul. It is inborn in us, like religion, with which it is inseparably bound up. Religion may appear, nay, has appeared, under different forms. Grotesque, irrational, these forms may be; but there never yet has been a religion in which prayer of some kind has not been given an important place and admitted as an essential element. With Pagan and Christian, Jew and Gentile, it is all the same.

In one of his Notre Dame conferences Lacordaire says: "All religions have called sacrifices, ceremonies, and prayer to the help of the soul striving towards God. Homer immolates victims with the liturgy of Leviticus; Delphos commands expiations in the same language which Benares speaks; the Etruscan augury blesses the Roman hills as the Druid consecrated the forests of Gaul; and above all those living rites of invisible custom the sacrament of prayer rises towards God to demand miracles of Him in the name

of all grief that hopes and of all weakness that believes. Doubtless prayer has not always known God under the same name; it has not everywhere known His true and eternal history; but the want was everywhere the same, the aspiration similar, and when the heart was sincere prayer did not fail to be efficacious." The same author, speaking of the supernatural intercourse between God and man, says: "Those among the sages who, like Plato, have left a religious memory, were all penetrated with serious respect for the vestiges of a tradition whose history they ignored. They avowed the infirmity of human thought left to its own resources, and endeavored to raise themselves toward God by the irrational effort of prayer. They belonged to the party of saints by desire, to the party of sages by ignorance."

"Mahomet," the same author says elsewhere, "made prayer the practical foundation of his religious edifice." Who that has read ever so little of Greek or Roman literature, has not over and over again met with references to libations, vows, and prayers to the gods of paganism? Homer, writing of propitiatory sacrifices to the offended Deities, thus expresses his own belief and that of his time and race:

"Offending man their high compassion wins,
And daily prayers atone for daily sins."

Let Pythagoras give evidence for the philosophers. He says:

"In all thou dost, first let thy prayers ascend,
And to the gods thy labors first commend;
From them implore success, and hope propitious end."

Plutarch, writing against the Epicureans, says that nobody ever found a people who had not their gods to whom they offered sacrifices and prayers to obtain benefits and to avert evil.

Here, then, we have prayer running unmistakably through every form of religion, and forming an important element in each; and there never has been a people without a religion of some kind. A fact so universal, so constant, must be accounted for. Whence has it come? It cannot be attributed to the choice or caprice of individuals or peoples; and that, for the very reason of its universality and constant presence in the history of every religion, in every age. We must go back further, then, and search for the reason of it in the nature of man. We must see if it be not an office that springs directly and at once from his conscience, teaching him the duty of prayer apart from, and independently of, any positive revealed law.

It is necessary now to bear in mind that prayer implies more than its ordinarily received meaning. Praying is petitioning God,

as we commonly understand it. But it means, moreover, adoration and thanksgiving; and a petition to God may be either for the pardon of faults or the granting of favors. There is nothing more natural to us than to be enraptured by the beautiful, to admire the sublime, to honor goodness and wisdom, to reverence greatness and power. One instinctively regards with respect the genius of Aristotle, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, and the other giant intellects that have arisen in the world's history from time to time, however he may differ from their teaching and principles. So it is with warriors, painters, sculptors, poets, etc.,—Alexander, Napoleon, Raphael, Michel-Angelo, Shakespeare, or Dante. A man may dislike the men, but he must admire their genius. Do not we not merely feel, but give spontaneous expression to our feelings, in the presence of the sublime or the beautiful in nature or in art? Clearly it was this that made men turn to the sun and moon, to rivers and mountains, and worship them, when, dulled by sin and passion, they had turned from and forgotten the one true God. It is not true, as it has been said, that by a law of indefinite progress, monotheism was the outcome of polytheism. The reverse is true; or, rather, it is true that polytheism stepped in where monotheism had died out. Men should have some form of religion, something to worship; and having lost their primitive faith in the one true God, they turned to other objects of worship, each according to his fancy or choice. It is under the same inborn influence that certain philosophers of our own day, who ignore a personal God, turn to humanity, and make it the object of their homage. All this unmistakably points to an instinctive craving in us for something to worship, and to the creation of feelings in us corresponding to the influence that objects are calculated to excite.

Now, we have our intellect, and it reasons back from effect to cause, and declares that there is a God. It cannot fathom the nature of God; it cannot comprehend Him; but it can and must know that a first cause there must be. It examines as far as it may into the nature and attributes of such a being, and it finds that a being existing of necessity must be infinitely perfect and the principle of all perfection; infinitely powerful and the principle of all power; infinitely wise and beautiful and the principle of all wisdom and beauty. It knows that itself, and everything we have, and everything that is, has come from God. Under this consciousness the intellect cannot remain unmoved. Having mounted up towards God, it bows down in homage before the Power, Wisdom, and Beauty from which all power, wisdom, and beauty spring; before the Creative Power from which everything that is has come. This is the prayer of adoration.

But there is again the heart of man. Does it remain motionless beside all this? The intellect knows the goodness of God; it sees it manifested in the creation, and again in the providence by which He preserves, governs, and guards everything, even the least that He has created.

“ Each little flower that opens,
Each little bird that sings,
He made their glowing colors,
He made their tiny wings,”

says the nursery rhyme.

Now, there are no persons we more despise than the ungrateful. This shows an innate persuasion in us that ingratitude ought not find a place in the human heart; that it is an exotic that ought not be there, but that ought to be plucked up and gratitude sown in its stead. Man is by nature disposed to gratitude for benefits received; ingratitude is a contraband import that the law of his nature prohibits him from entertaining. And as the knowledge of God and His attributes calls forth from the intellect the prayer of adoration, gratitude for the blessing of creation and the untold blessings dispensed by the providence of God calls forth from the heart the prayer of thanksgiving. Once more, the intellect knows that mercy is an attribute of God, and trusting to His mercy we are most naturally moved to ask Him for pardon of our faults. We know that goodness is an attribute of His, and we ask Him to manifest His providence in our behalf in the way of granting spiritual and temporal favors that we need, or of averting spiritual or temporal evils that we fear.

Looked at, then, in the light of natural religion, prayer is both a duty and a necessity; and the necessity enforces the duty. Other considerations may be made use of to establish our position; and the argument we have used, if drawn out to greater length, would show itself more forcible and convincing. Enough has, however, been said for our purpose. Viewed directly, and with the light of sound philosophy, the way appears quite clear. But another philosophy throws another light upon it, and makes impediments appear, or rather casts them in the way; and these it is our purpose to remove, or rather to show that they are not what they appear to be. We have abstained, too, from strengthening our position by the aid of revealed religion, because with the exception of some illogical persons, those who deny the use or the necessity of prayer deny also that there is a revealed religion. So unmistakably does Revelation inculcate prayer that we are perforce driven into the admission or denial of both together. Of course we nevertheless claim the aid and testimony of Sacred Scripture as an historical witness to the belief of man from the very beginning,

that the need of prayer is involved in the need of our intercourse with God.

Although prayer, as we have seen, holds, and has always held, an important place in every system of religion worthy of the name, it does not constitute religion. That was the error of the Messianians, a sect, partly Pagan and partly Christian, that flourished for a time in the East. They taught that the disposition of Divine Providence is variable, and may be changed by prayer; also that every one has a devil attached to him from his birth, and that prayer only can banish it. These and other absurdities that they taught are exceeded in absurdity by the practices of their lives.

On the other hand, there are those with whom prayer of any kind would be illogical and meaningless—even the prayer of adoration and thanksgiving. Such are atheists and pantheists. The former, because they admit no object they might pray to; the latter, because they are themselves an essential part of a necessary whole, which, therefore, for obvious reasons, it would be folly for them to adore or praise, and useless to petition for good or against evil. To these must be added a large number of pseudo-philosophers of the present day, whose avowed principles, whatever be their professions, logically and immediately merge into one or the other.

Beyond this the question turns exclusively on the prayer of petition; and those who repudiate it as a thing absurd, or at least useless, do so for various reasons. To allow it any efficacious influence, and therefore any meaning, it is necessary to recognize Divine Providence, to begin with. That is a preliminary position without which prayer would necessarily be without effect and without a purpose. When one prays, he prays for something to be obtained or averted, and this implies a hope that the prayer may be heard and the desired result produced. Prayer offered for no definite purpose, and without an expectation or any reason for expecting that any good may come of it, would be irrational, unless one may set himself to pray for pastime. But if God, having created the universe, stopped there, and thenceforth let it take its natural course, like a sovereign who, having set the affairs of his government in motion, betakes himself to some apartment whence he watches everything, but never interferes; in other words, if there be no Providence governing the world, prayer at once becomes an impious mockery, or, at most, a purposeless trifling. Hence, into that school of theism that would have God take as little concern about us and the world as a watchmaker does about a timepiece he has made, set its mechanism in motion, and sold, prayer can never enter. To these, as to the last-mentioned class, we have nothing to say. The ground of their denial of prayer is their denial of Providence; and to prove the efficacy of the former

against them we should begin by establishing the reality of the latter. But that is outside our purpose. Besides, after we had asserted the providence of God, the difficulty may not, and likely would not, end there. For, granted that the universe is governed by Providence, what are we to understand by it? Different theorists attach different meanings to it, and some of them seem as incompatible with prayer as no providence at all. Indeed, providence, in the sense in which it is understood and explained by some, is really no providence at all.

We shall take up, then, and consider a few of the leading difficulties which unbelievers in the reasonableness of prayer throw out but to justify their position according to their respective notions of Divine Providence. Other difficulties, such as disbelief in any interference on the part of God with the course and order of the world, lead the way to, and ultimately end in, that one. The nucleus of our difficulty lies in showing that the incompatibility of prayer with God's action in the world is only apparent, not real. When repulsed from other positions, they will fly to this, and it is the last battle-ground they can take up.

Now, then, they urge the untenableness of prayer because of its incompatibility with the unchangeableness, knowledge, and goodness of God on the one hand, and on the other with the system of laws decreed by Him for the government of the world. "Do what we can," says Jules Simon, "it is impossible to take away from God His immutability and eternity. Prayer brings us no other good than to draw us nearer to God by meditation and love." Moreover, is not God all-seeing, and does He not know our desires and our needs? Is He not infinitely good, and will He not, knowing them, satisfy the one if it be good for us, and provide for the other if it be real? But the theory of prayer implies either that we may have wants and wishes which God may not know, or that, knowing them, His goodness may possibly not provide for them without the importunity of our prayers.

We have, on the other hand, to deal with the alleged incompatibility of prayer with the uniformity that science has discovered in the laws of nature. "Say that it has come by design, by chance, or from necessity, just as it pleases you; that it has been prearranged by a personal God, or that it is the outcome of nature existing always, one thing is certain," they say, namely, that the universe is governed by an unvarying law, which it would be vain to attempt to break or disturb. This is a scientific certainty, and anything opposed to it must be unscientific and untrue. It implies, therefore, the unreasonableness of prayer, because it deprives it of an office and a purpose. It ignores it as a thing silly and unsubstantial, leaving it no scientific basis on which to rest. And this prin-

ciple of uniformity in nature seems to confront prayer from every side to which its influence is directed. For we pray either (*a*) for temporal blessings, or the averting of temporal evils, such as rain, fair weather, the cessation of a pestilence, or the curing of a fever; (*b*) for spiritual blessings, or the averting of spiritual evils, such as an increase of grace, protection from temptation, etc.; or (*c*) for social blessings, or the averting of social evils, such as, that sounder principles may govern the political and religious life of the nation, that principles opposed to public morality and the public weal may be discountenanced and checked. But there is this unvarying law governing the *physical*, the *moral*, and the *social* world, and it frustrates the assumed power of prayer, or, rather, denies that it has any.

In the first instance, prayer finds its opponents in a certain class of physicists who are remarkable for arrogating to themselves a monopoly of knowledge in physical science, as if nobody else knew anything about it. "They ask for fair weather or for rain," says Professor Tyndall, "but they do not ask that water may run up a hill, while the man of science clearly sees that the granting of one petition would be just as much an infringement of the law of conservation as the granting of the other. Holding the law to be permanent, he prays for neither." Possibly it was a similar belief that drew from Lord Palmerston the well-known reply he made to the deputation asking him to order public prayers against the cholera: "Don't mind your prayers, but keep the sewers cleansed." In the second place, according to a certain school of psychologists, mental phenomena are under laws quite as fixed as those that govern the physical world; and hence it is no less irrational to pray for grace, or against temptation, than for fair weather or against a plague. From this the distance is very short and easy to the third ground of opposition, namely, that peoples no less than individuals are guided and governed by an inflexible law. The philosophy of history has been taught by many on this hypothesis. The theory as held by Buckle is summarized in the following words by Justin McCarthy, in his "History of our own Times:" "All movements of history, and, indeed, of human life, through all its processes, are regulated by fixed physical laws as certain as those which rule the motions of the waves and the changes of the weather, and of which we could arrive at a sound and trustworthy knowledge if we were content to study their phenomena as we do the phenomena of the seas and the skies." It is therefore useless, indeed impious, to pray for, let us say, the extirpation of socialism or the conversion of England. We may here observe that under the second class may logically be brought Calvinists, Jansenists,

Wyclifites, and all, in a word, who, on principle, must address God in the words of Robert Burns :

“ Oh Thou, wha in the heavens dost dwell,
Wha, as it pleases best, Thysel',
Sends one to heaven and ten to hell,
A' for Thy glory,
And no for any good or ill
They've done afore Thee !”

The difficulties raised against the efficacy of prayer because of the immutability of God, and against its reasonableness because of His knowledge and goodness, are easily disposed of. The difficulty brought from the immutability of God proves too much against prayer, and, therefore, as logicians say, proves nothing. It would, if it had any force at all, militate against the creation quite as well.

The following words of Origen and St. Thomas will suffice to dispel it. The former, writing against Celsus, says : “ God, remaining the same, administers changeable things according to their nature and as reason demands that they should be administered.” The latter says : “ It is one thing to change the will, it is another thing to will a change in anything. For any one, his will remaining unchanged, may will one thing now and its contrary afterwards.”¹ The *now* and the *afterwards*, it is to be observed, refer to the object, not to the will directing the change. That prayer implies limited knowledge or limited goodness on the part of God, will appear equally false from the words of St. Thomas. He says : “ God gives us many things without our asking them. But it is for our good that He requires us to ask some things; for we thus acquire a confidence in Him, and at the same time acknowledge Him as the author of everything we have.”² We are apt to forget gifts and benefactors unless we feel that we may need them again. And if every want of ours, spiritual and temporal, were supplied by God as a matter of course, and without our asking, we would soon forget to look upon them as favors, and would come to look on them as our due. We would eventually forget our dependence on God, because the need of prayer is our best reminder of it; and absolution from the duty of prayer would easily lead to neglect of adoration.

Then again, belief in prayer is dismissed by a certain school of physicists as an irrational superstition of the credulous, but beneath the patronage of science,—indeed, opposed to its progress and destructive of its interests. That the law of phenomenal sequence runs through nature, can, they say, be neither disputed nor ignored.

¹ Summa, I, quest. 19, art. 7.

² Summa, xxii, quest. 83, art. 2.

It is a fact. It is not the offspring of the imagination, but the conviction of reason; not a law made to order to suit a purpose, but that has forced itself on the student of nature by the power of its persuasiveness and the evidence of its truth. Physical causes, then, always produce their natural effects. If the causes of rain be present, rain will come, and as long as these causes remain, and all the circumstances to be considered continue favorable, rain will continue. If these causes, considered with their circumstances, cease, rain will cease, and fair weather, frost or snow, according to causes and circumstances, will ensue. If a certain disease, all circumstances considered, be more than the vital power of its patient can endure, it will be fatal; if not, or if it be properly diagnosed and treated by medical skill, the patient will recover. But death or recovery, rainy or fair weather—in either case, prayer can have no place as a cause, and it would be irrational to admit it. Strychnine will poison, sugar will taste sweet, vinegar sour, and fire will burn. What nonsense, then, to believe that St. Benedict disinfected the poisoned cup by his prayer, or that certain martyrs passed unscathed through the ordeal of fire! If your friend be ill of a fever, pray, if you please, for your friend's recovery; if you want rain, pray, if you please, that it may come; but do not in the name of reason be guilty of the folly of thinking that your prayer has had a share in bringing about either result, although both should come. What has happened would have happened though never prayed for; what has not happened has not failed to happen because you have not prayed, nor would it have happened though you had prayed.

The objection is specious; but it is nothing more. Although physical science has made us acquainted with the laws of nature to a surprising extent, all, nevertheless, are not known to us. There are forces in nature, perhaps, which we have yet to discover. There are many which we know, but do not know the full value of. There may be a thousand complications and circumstances that influence the relative action of forces on one another that we are yet ignorant of. But they are all within God's knowledge and under His power. What right, then, has any one to say that God does not interfere in this or that instance, in answer to prayer, with causes and circumstances which do not appear to us in connection with the result prayed for, but which, combined and prearranged, issue in causes which, with their attendant circumstances, produce, it is true, their natural effect, but an effect owing none the less to Divine interposition in answer to prayer. God certainly may do so; how can any one dare to say that He does not?

The physical forces at work in the world are a vast and complicated machinery, the parts of which have been arranged and the whole designed by the wisdom of God; and when we can say that

we understand it all, if we find to a certainty that it leaves no room for Divine interposition, we might then with some reason deny the power of prayer. But until then, it is but an irrational skepticism that would ask men to reject as folly a belief that they have held from the beginning, a tradition that is as sacred as nature itself, because as old.

But even granting, it may be said, that God may and does interfere with the laws of nature, that does not help to dislodge the difficulty. It leaves it exactly in the same position, because the fact remains all the same that the laws of nature are interfered with, and their uniformity destroyed; and that science will not tolerate. Now, this brings us face to face with a consideration that is overlooked in the objection, and that ought not to be. It is this: The objection assumes that prayer had no place in the original design of the world in the conception of God. It implies that prayer is something that takes God as if by surprise, and importunes Him to disturb the prearranged harmony of things. It implies, too, that Divine interposition does not enter into the governing of the world, whereas, not only does it, but continually does. "It does not follow," says Dr. Ward, "that because the laws of nature are fixed, they proceed independently of God's constant and unremitting premovement." It is not in answer to prayer that this interposition is constant, for God interferes always; but He has decreed eternally that it would be sometimes in answer to prayer. He thus made prayer enter into and be one of the laws that govern the world. Therefore St. Thomas says that "we pray not to change what Divine Providence has disposed, but to ask that what He has disposed would come to pass." We commend to those who may wish to read it the argument of St. Thomas contained in Art. II., Ques. 83, in the *secunda secundæ*; it dissipates the difficulty in a few sentences.

The Rev. Mr. Knight, in an article in the *Contemporary Review*, for January, 1873, whilst admitting prayer as an agency in the spiritual world, denies it any power in the physical world. One of the reasons that he gives is that "there is no confusion of the spheres of moral and physical agency. To put it otherwise, a spiritual antecedent will not produce a physical consequent." Now, this seems strange logic. If he means that the spiritual act of prayer will not bring down showers of rain from the clouds or make the sun shine, it is of course true; but surely it was not necessary to tell us so. If he means that God, in answer to prayer, cannot or will not produce physical effects, he makes an assertion that he ought to prove, and does not. To say that God cannot do it is impious; to say that He will not do it is precisely supposing the question. Again he says: "It is vain to reply that we are

continually interfering with seemingly fixed laws of the universe, and altering their destination by our voluntary activities or scientific appliances; for in all such cases we simply make use of existing forces. We are ourselves a part of the physical cosmos, and in accordance with its laws we exert a power which changes external nature. But we can never escape from the domain of law." Quite so; but all this is but a levelling down of the denial he has been laboring to build up; a corroborating by his testimony of what he has proposed to demolish. This dialectical suicide arises from having overlooked two things: 1st, the fact of a Divine premovement in the government of the world; 2d, that prayer enters into the action of that premovement. Before any one can afford to deny the efficacy of prayer, he must first of all show the falsity of these. To admit the efficacy of prayer, it is not at all necessary to go outside the "domain of law." That God answers prayer does not necessarily nor always mean that He works a miracle, although it is true that the denial of prayer involves a denial of miracles.

But if, let it be replied, prayer enters into the eternal disposition of God, it follows that something happens as the result of prayer; some effects are produced because they have been prayed for. What, then, if they had not been prayed for? Would they have happened, or would they not? If they would, they would have happened without prayer, and then prayer was useless; and if useless in these cases, why not in every case? If they would not have happened, then the uniformity of the law of nature would have been destroyed, not however, from the effect, but from the defect of prayer. They did not happen because prayer was not offered to obtain them. Here, then, is a result logically flowing from the theory of prayer. The free will of man and the eternal decrees of God are placed in direct antagonism, ready to destroy each other. For, if we may refuse to pray for a certain thing that is to be obtained by prayer, we elude and frustrate the Divine disposition; if we may not refuse to pray on that particular occasion and for that particular purpose, it must be because God has taken away our free-will in order to make us an instrument wherewith to have His decree executed. What shall we say to this? We have already observed that in the disposition of God some things will happen without prayer, and some things will happen in answer to prayer; and we say that when these latter are to happen, prayer will infallibly be offered to obtain them. We say *infallibly*, not *necessarily*. For St. Thomas says: "God has prepared necessary causes for certain effects, that they would necessarily follow; for others He has prepared contingent causes, that they would follow contingently according to the nature of the proximate causes;"¹

¹ Summa, I, quest. 22, art. 4.

"for," he says, "all things happen according to His provision, whether necessarily or contingently."¹ Again, "if it be the provision of God that this or that would happen, it will happen, and according to His provision. If He provides that it would happen contingently, it will, indeed, infallibly happen, but contingently, not necessarily."² We hope that these quotations from the Angelic Doctor will suffice to dispel this seeming antagonism between our free-will and the Divine disposition arising from the doctrine of prayer. The whole force of St. Thomas's argument rests on the distinction that one may *infallibly* do a thing without *necessarily* doing it.

But we have not yet gone quite half way. It is not for temporal blessings exclusively that prayer is offered; it is also offered, and indeed much more frequently, for spiritual blessings. But the psychologist of the Herbert Spencer type steps in and reminds us that mind no less than matter is governed by law; that there is a persistency in the connection between the different states of consciousness as there is in the order of events that come under the consideration of physical science. And setting out from this law, the philosopher just named traces the growth of the human mind from instinct, on through regular gradations of development, to reason and moral consciousness. "In all this," psychologists ask, "where is the place for prayer, or what can its office be?"

Of course we repudiate the system of psychology on which the difficulty is based, to begin with. But supposing it to be true, it shuts out prayer for the same reason as does physical science, for both proceed on analogous principles. What we have said, therefore, to show the reasonableness of prayer, notwithstanding the one, holds equally good against the other. Indeed the psychical difficulty is not so involved as the physical. We have seen how the objection drawn from physical science indirectly brings on the question of free-will; but in the other case this cannot be, and for the very good reason that the system of psychology that patronizes the objection cannot suppose such a thing as free-will, unless perhaps in name. But there is another consideration that deprives the psychologist of any logical right to reject prayer, and it flows from his own principles. It cannot be denied that prayer has always and everywhere held a place in the belief of men. The psychologist may deny its right to be there, but he cannot deny the fact. Whence came it? Either it was inducted by man himself through superstition, or from other motives, or it is a natural growth in the mind. If the former, then man may, as he pleases, regulate the action of his mind; and if man can, why not God?

¹ Summa, I, quest. 22, art. 4, ad 2.

² Gentiles, quest. 3, chap. 94.

If the latter, then the psychologist, in attempting to shut out prayer as a thing irrational, stands self-convicted himself of the most irrational of acts.

Then, lastly, we may not pray for social blessings or the averting of social evils, because if the "movements of history are regulated by fixed physical laws," the philosophy of history is quite as much a science as the philosophy of nature. It will not be necessary for us to say anything on this phase of the difficulty, as it has been already met in the last. For what is the material element in society but the aggregate of the individuals who compose it? As the individual is, therefore, so will be the social edifice which he contributes an individual's mind and an individual's morality to build up.

So much for objections. There are others of a particular character that might be brought up and examined with profit, did space permit. We have selected those we have examined, because they strike at the root of prayer by trying to undermine its principles; and we have classified them both with a view to conciseness, and that the ground of attack may appear more clear.

We will bring this already rather lengthy article to a close by recalling a test which Professor Tyndall, some years since, thought of applying to the efficacy of prayer. It is, as will be perceived, characteristic of men of his class. He proposed, if we do not mistake, that in a certain hospital the proportion of those who die and recover to those attacked by a certain disease would be carefully noted down; that a ward would then be set apart for all cases of the same disease, that they would be treated with the same medical skill as before, and, in addition, that public prayers would be offered up for their recovery. After the experiment had got a fair chance, he would have the percentage of deaths and recoveries ascertained, and thus see if the prayers had effected any good.

Risum tencatis, amici! The test reminds us of a blasphemous challenge which Mr. Bradlaugh is reported to have made, when, on an occasion of his lecturing on atheism, he pulled out his watch and gave God five minutes to strike him dead. If he was not struck dead in the given time, the conclusion was to be that there is no such being as God. We have heard that an Irish working-man present, on hearing the blasphemy, at once started up and replied: "Wisha, God has something else to do than to waste His time with a fellow like you." Although Professor Tyndall's test is not as revolting as this, it is scarcely less meaningless. To omit other reflections on it, it will be enough to observe:

1st. It wants the very first condition of prayer, namely, sincerity. When we pray we are supposed to be in earnest; but here there would be no earnestness, for the prayers would be offered only

nominally for the recovery of the patients, but really to put prayer to a test. This is simply tempting God. Had Professor Tyndall seriously wished to know the value of prayer, he could know it from the assurance of God Himself revealed in Holy Scripture and in the tradition of mankind; and if he would not hear the voice of God thus revealed, it is not likely he would recognize it in such Brahminical jugglery as this. Besides, God will not be moved to signify His will to captious incredulousness. "You ask for a sign," said our blessed Lord to the Pharisee, "but a sign you shall not get unless the sign of Jonas."

2d. The test is based on a false supposition, namely, that God will always grant in answer to prayer the specific favor prayed for.

3d. How could it be known that prayers were not offered up also for the patients who were treated in the hospital before the special ward was set apart for the prayer test? They may not be public prayers; they may not be as many; but they may be more efficacious. The power of prayer does not proceed on the principle of mechanics, that a system of levers will do more work than one. The humble prayer of one may avail more before God than the united prayers of a thousand. Then, if the percentage of recoveries turned out to be higher in the special ward than it was before, would Professor Tyndall, we wonder, believe in prayer on the strength of his own test? Perhaps the light of science may reveal to him, in the meantime, some new physiological law that brought about the high percentage of cures. We ask, may not the result of the prayer-test possibly be this: If the percentage of cures under the test happened to be lower than usual, prayer was found out to be useless? If it turned out to be higher, it was owing to a complicity of physiological causes and circumstances, but not to prayer? In the first event, the result told against prayer; in the second event, it did not tell for it.

THE RUSSO-GREEK CHURCH.

IN the year 1839 there was, in the heart of the Oxford movement, a dear friend of Mr. Newman's, a brother of Lord Selborne, recently Lord Chancellor of England, who had ardently embraced the notion of a Christendom broken into three unequal portions, not absolutely severed from each other, yet very imperfectly united. These were the Roman, Greek and Anglican Churches. To the mind of Mr. Palmer, then a Fellow of Magdalen College, there was something particularly attractive in the quaint, antique, poetic and oriental forms of the Russian Church. He saw in it a multitude of long-established types and symbols, sacramental in their nature because consecrated to the service of religion, and teeming with instruction in the mysteries of the faith. He desired to be admitted into communion with this vast Greco-Russian society, and before leaving England he fortified himself with documents from the hands of Dr. Routh, the head of Magdalen College, and placed himself in communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Such a proceeding may at the present moment appear to be the result of a singular delusion; but that also it appeared to Mr. Palmer himself as time went on, for in 1855 he was received into the Catholic Church, and repudiated for ever the supposed catholicity of the English Convocation and the Russian Synod alike. He had for some years been cruising about in Anglican waters for the discovery of "signs of catholicity," and had fancied he found even there what the people of England certainly could not find, an apostolical succession, the real presence, an altar and a priesthood; how much more, therefore, would his imagination find the Russian waters full of these catholic signs of the presence of Christ and the saints, the living sacraments, the covenanted gifts of Grace.

It was in this frame of mind that the young Oxford examiner found himself in St. Petersburg, in the midst of a church-going population. Very different was their mode of attendance from that of Protestant or Catholic. It was not with the Protestant bustle and eagerness for the instruction of preachers, nor with the Catholic devotion in the adoration of the Host, but rather in distinct and innumerable acts of reverence, prayer and praise, towards saints, angels or *icons*. A great deal had to be *done*. Scarcely a limb was at rest, pious gesticulations were abundant, there were bowings and crossings, *icons* were kissed, the ground was touched, sometimes audibly thumped with the forehead, and wax lights were set

up to burn, while soft and most peculiar music filled the air and soothed the thoughts. There was neatness around and magnificence; the people seemed to be in earnest, they all confessed and communicated once a year, and many of the more devout four times, once at each of the four fasts. It was not, therefore, without pleasure that Mr. Palmer listened to that sweet and solemn singing of the *Hospodi pomu lui* (*Kyrie eleison*) in the Church of the Ascension, and saw the splendid pictures lit up, while the sharp treble voices of the boys mixed with the deeper tones of the older singers of the congregation. It is a question, he said, of association of ideas, and rites that are very different may by custom be alike hallowed to the mind and the means of bringing it into happy intercourse with the Eternal Spirit. There is something unique in the richness and softness of the music in some of the Russian Ambassadors' chapels and churches at which the Emperor or members of the Imperial family are present. Five and twenty years ago the music in the Russian Ambassadors' chapel at Rome—we think it was in the Corso—was remarkable for its sweetness and peculiar character, unlike anything we had ever heard before. Lady Bloomfield tells us in her diary of February 1st, 1846: "I went to a private rehearsal of the choir of the Emperor's chapel, and I was surprised and delighted with the beauty of the music, which certainly exceeded any I had ever heard. I only regretted that the music was performed in too small a room for the voices to be sufficiently appreciated; the effect would have been so much grander had I been at a greater distance from the choir. There were about eighty-six voices altogether, which was not the full complement; but with his usual magnificence, the Emperor sent 12 of the finest voices to Rome, that on her arrival there the Empress might have her own choir. Nothing could exceed the beauty of the voices; and their gradual swelling and decreasing was very striking. . . . The finest voices come from White Russia; but whenever any one throughout the Empire has an unusually rich voice he is engaged, and certainly I never heard such voices—from the deepest diapason bass to the highest tenor. Bartniansky's music is very impressive. The words are Slavonic; and those which are sung during the administration of the Holy Communion are in the following sense: 'Let us not approach Thee, O Lord, in this Thy holy Sacrament, like the traitor Judas, who betrayed Thee with a kiss; but as the thief upon the cross, let us, with deep humility and unfeigned sorrow, confess our sinfulness, and cry, Lord, remember me.'"¹ "The singing in churches here," says Mr. Palmer in another stage of his visit, "is certainly very pleasing, suited to the sense of the words, moving and devout. . . . Where there is a choir of singers, some parts of the services are sung to music

¹ *Reminiscences of Court and Diplomatic Life*, vol. i. pp. 179-181.

arranged in parts. This music, which is based upon that of the books, is not printed. It has much in it borrowed from the Italian. Some time ago a certain first-rate Italian singer, being in the kapella or practicing-room of the choir of the Winter Palace, was moved to tears by what they were singing when she came in, though she did not know a word of Russ, nor was told till afterwards that what she heard was part of the office for the dead. The singings for the Resurrection at Easter inspire the whole congregation with the most lively joy; it is impossible not to feel transported; the responses to the priest's announcement, 'Christ is risen!' are made with an indescribable buzz or hum (*cum fremitu*) running over the whole church. Fortununatoff's mother had a great wish to die in Easter week, and this is a popular feeling."

But here we must offer excuses to our readers if we appear to be tricking out an effete schism in attractive colors or endeavoring to recommend the system bequeathed to men by Photius, and repaired for a brief period only at the council of Lyons in 1274. Five hundred bishops were then present, and a great number of inferior prelates. At the close of the fourth session, the Pope, with gushing tears, intoned the *Credo* in Latin, which being done, the former Patriarch of Constantinople, Germanus, began it in Greek, and the "filioque" was chanted twice over. That happy reunion was not destined to endure, and for many ages the sectarians of the Greek and Russian Churches have ranged themselves under the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Patriarch resident at Moscow, or the Emperor of Russia himself. Cut off from the centre of unity, and refusing to the Vicar of Christ and successor of St. Peter his due honor and obedience, this vast body is deprived of innumerable blessings and left comparatively barren and desolate where it might have abounded in the gifts of grace. Nothing that we may say to show that it still lives, that it is still a Christian organism, that it has in it much that is venerable and lovely, must be interpreted as meaning anything more than that it may be restored and partake fully of the benedictions which belong to the earthly Eden and the Garden of the Lord. It is necessary to state this very distinctly, so that all misinterpretation may be avoided, because Mr. Palmer, whose steps we are about to follow, was possessed of other ideas, and was travelling in Russia in the belief that he was in the midst of Catholics and that he had become one himself by the ministrations and sacraments of the Anglican Church. We shall rejoice, however, as he rejoiced, at every token of good, every gleam of Catholic beauty we can discover around us in the far North, and hope that the dream of reunion in which he indulged will ultimately be realized.

The rule of the old Patriarchs has gone by, and their power has

gradually been accumulated into the hands of the Tsars. They had obtained considerable political influence, and Peter the Great, being jealous of this, omitted to appoint a successor to the Patriarch of Moscow in 1700. The interregnum lasted for 21 years, and then the Patriarchate was formally abolished and the "Holy Synod" took its place. Since that time the control and regulation of the Russian Church have been committed to its keeping. Peter obtained from the Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Constantinople and Alexandria, assembled in council, a recognition of this new arrangement and of the right of the Russian Sovereign to a complete protectorate over the Church of the country. It is he who nominates all the members of the Holy Synod, Archbishops, Bishops, and Archimandrites, with their lay assessors, and the supremacy of the Tsar has been established without any breach of communion with the "Orthodox Greek Church."¹

But the national Church is not, by this means, so secularized as to cease to be dogmatic. It still plumes itself upon its points of faith. You enter the magnificent chapel of a foundling hospital, and you find a great number of children, singing all together the Creed in the "grace" before their dinner, and producing a volume of the sweetest sound. You desire exact information respecting their tenets, and you are referred immediately to "The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, A.D. 1643," "The Confession of Dositheus or the Eighteen Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem, A.D. 1672," and the "Longer Catechism of the Russian Church, prepared by Philaret, revised and approved by the Most Holy Synod, A.D. 1839."²

A year or two before Mr. Palmer visited St. Petersburg, Mr. Blackmore translated from the Russ "The full Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Church" (of Russia), and English travellers now have not the least difficulty in obtaining information on the subject of the teaching of the Russian clergy. They profess to stand on the ground of the Seven Ecumenical Councils and the tradition of the undivided Church, from which they maintain that the Eastern Church has never swerved—an assertion which, of course, the Latins altogether dispute. Their faith is not dead. An officer observed to Mr. Palmer that they have an unspeakable consolation in their belief that the Blessed Sacrament is really Christ's Body and Blood. Religious books do not abound among them, but Mr. Palmer has given, in his Appendix, a list of as many as forty-four such works, besides the Synodal Collection of Fathers, translated into Russ, which are sold in St. Petersburg and Moscow. But there

¹ The Russian Empire, by S. B. Boulton, 1882, pp. 43-44.

² Schaff's "Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches," 1877.

can be no doubt that spiritual and intellectual life is retarded by schism, and that the Russians in general take little interest in the movements and questions of nations further south. But to say of them, as Mr. Wallace says,¹ that "of theology and of what Protestants term the 'inner religious life' the Russian peasant has no conception," is to go beyond the truth.

Inactive minds are always a prey to superstitions, and the Russians are specially deluded by the idea that the preservation of the body for an unusual length of time in an incorrupt state is a sign of sanctity and is miraculous, whereas Cardinal Newman takes particular care in his notes to show that such incorruption often arises from natural causes and sometimes occurs in the case of persons who have led wicked lives. Cardinal Lambertini (Benedict XIV.) does not go beyond this—that "writers on canonization commonly admit that the incorruption (as they speak) of a corpse is to be accounted a miracle, *in case* it is clear that the man whose corpse is in question was, in his lifetime, conspicuous for heroic virtues." The Patriarchs, having surrendered their rights into the hands of the Tsar, have forfeited their existence as an order, have paralyzed the action of their Church as a spiritual body, have frozen up, to a great extent, the waters of salvation, and punished the fault and error of severing their communion from the See of Peter. It remains to be seen whether repentance and enlightenment will ever again restore them to unity, and rescue them from many superstitions. Nothing can show more clearly than the Coronation service used in Russia the state of subjection of the Church to the Tsar. Mr. Palmer has pointed out with great accuracy—insomuch that Cardinal Newman does not think it necessary to confirm his statements by any references—the points in the Ritual, both in word and act, indicating the imperial supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs. Everything is made to proceed from his own *proprio motu*. The Emperor Paul, who crowned himself at Moscow in 1797, and is regarded by Mr. Palmer as the founder of a new dynasty, after the Liturgy, or Mass, read aloud publicly in the church that act regulating the Imperial succession by which the present dynasty was established in its rights. He then placed it upon the altar, where, or behind which, it is still preserved. It contains the words he had just before read aloud, that the Sovereign of Russia is always to profess the creed of the Greco-Russian Church, "because he is the Head of the Church." He sat alone in the centre of the nave of the church, a carpet being laid thence up to the Holy Doors, and the members of the Synod (who may, or not, be bishops) and the bishops stood below, on either side of this carpet, opposite one another. He sat, in short, exactly as a

¹ "Russia," by D. Mackenzie Wallace, vol. i., p. 97.

patriarch or primate would sit at the head of his clergy, and showed himself visibly in the church as the Head of the Church and of the so-called Synod and all the clergy. As did the Emperor Paul, so have done the Tsars who have succeeded him.

It was still summer, in the year 1840, when Mr. Palmer was able to lay before the Ober Prokuror, Count Pratasoff, to be presented to the Emperor, the special object with which he had visited Russia, namely, to live in the Spiritual Academy, or some monastery, or under some bishop, and thus learn the Russian language, study the doctrines, discipline and ritual of the Church of the country, and be admitted into its communion, not as a convert but as a Catholic belonging to another orthodox branch of the Church of Christ. The request could not but cause great surprise for various reasons, but above all because it seemed to be wholly at variance with the habits and notions of other Englishmen and Englishwomen, including travellers, residents abroad, merchants and officials, servants, writers, bishops and archbishops, ministers, and the sovereign and supreme head of the Church of England. None of them, or at most a handful only, could be found to lend any countenance to the very peculiar views and aspirations of the Oxford Fellow.

In prosecuting his design, the singular defender of "Anglo-Catholicism" was brought into contact with persons scarcely less remarkable than himself, and the records he has given of his intercourse with them, though exceedingly simple and unpretentious, are, in the highest degree, curious and entertaining. When taken to the Synodal Palace, he was presented to M. Mourarieff, and dropped at once into the discussion of grave points with "a tall, indeed gigantic, man, for a cavalry officer, and needing a strong horse to carry him." The next acquaintance was the Arch-priest Vasili Kontnevich, High Armorer of the Army and Fleet. He ranked last of the eight members of the Synod, and so had always to give his opinion first on any matter brought before it. He conversed with Mr. Palmer in Latin, and their conversation threaded the narrow paths of the question of the procession of the Holy Ghost and of the primacy and supremacy of the Pope. The Catholic, who follows attentively this and the many subsequent debates, will remember Dr. Johnson's wise words: "The human mind is so limited that it cannot take in all the parts of a subject, so that there may be objections raised against everything;" and he will rejoice that, for him, at least, Christian dogma is settled, once for all. The Greco-Russian Church is not conscious of any such immutability, though it is not by any means given to change. Prince Alexander Galitzin, Grand Master of Requests, another acquaintance made by our traveller, admitted that there had been an inno-

vating spirit in some of the Russian divines, mentioning Philaret of Moscow as having been foremost in showing that tendency. "But, it has now," he said, "been checked." There were some manifest Latinisms in the Eighteen Articles of Bethlehem of A. D. 1672, which had been omitted or corrected (according to Mr. Palmer) in the Russian translation then recently published. The variations were concerned with the use of the words substance and accidents in reference to the subject of transubstantiation. But there were priests in Russia during Mr. Palmer's visit—the Arch-priest Kontnevich was one—who still maintained, as their own opinion, that their Church agrees with Rome about the distinction of substance and accidents in the Blessed Eucharist.¹

"In the last century," said M. Mouravieff to Mr. Palmer, "here, as everywhere else, there was a leaning towards Protestantism. Peter III. and Catherine II. did much mischief, and had well-nigh abolished the monasteries; but now all that is past, and there is everywhere a reaction, and the monks have nothing to fear. The only thing to be done now is to keep things as they are, and to improve them."

Unsatisfactory as the dogmatic status of the Greco-Russian Church must appear to a Catholic, he will be perfectly satisfied with the judgment the authorities at St. Petersburg pronounced on Mr. Palmer's application. They regarded it as altogether inadmissible, and, with every wish to be polite and conciliating, they were scarcely able to consider it seriously. It flew in the face of history and put forward a claim than which nothing could be more unreasonable. The supremacy of the Tsar was innocent and orthodox in comparison with the monstrous and even blasphemous assumptions of the British Crown. But it is to be observed that highly cultivated theologians, who were deeply sensible of the deep mental degradation of the Russian clergy and the still greater ignorance of the Greek priests, were not, on that account, a whit the less firm in their opinion that it would be impossible to admit Mr. Palmer to communion. "Any one," they said, "who would communicate with the Oriental Church, must take her just as she is, for she can do nothing to meet him."

Many privileges were accorded to Mr. Palmer seldom shared by English travellers, because seldom sought and requiring conditions for mutual intercourse seldom in existence. He visited the Monastery of St. Sergius, where he was permitted to remain for a few days, and he conversed with the Archimandrite Brenchininoff. Such monasteries have commonly a plan and appearance, such as the traveller here describes: "As one approaches from without, one sees a battlemented wall, with towers perhaps at

¹ See the "Notes of a Visit," etc., pp. 153, 169, and Schaff's "Creeds," p. 431.

intervals, especially over or near the great gates, the walls about which are painted in colors, with some scriptural or ecclesiastical history, and there will be an icon over the doorway. The walls themselves are whitewashed, but the copings of the battlements and the conical tops of the towers are colored green or red. But, before noticing them, one has probably seen in the distance, or caught glimpses at intervals, of the five gilded cupolas or crosses of the chief church, rising above the walls or among the trees, and, highest of all, the bulb of the belfry-tower. On entering, one sees the lodgings of the monks attached all round to the wall of the precinct, like casemates. Even if there is no cemetery, there will be green turf round the central church, divided by gravel-walks or flag-pavements, sometimes with avenues of trees leading up to the church, and there will be similar pavements or walls running all round the precinct in front of the cells. Probably, too, there will be a number of trees scattered about within, which, though not of any beauty or size in the north of Russia, give a more varied and more cheerful aspect to the place, especially in summer."

While staying in the Monastery of St. Sergius, and conversing from time to time with the Archimandrite, there was nothing, unfortunately, more evident than that the Russian priesthood at present, so far as it can be said to have studied the question at all, reject in the most decided manner the "Filioque" and the supremacy of the Pope, and cling with tenacity to a long list of ecclesiastical customs to which Rome would undoubtedly be averse. And what is to be the end of an empire in which the government is inseparably bound up with a Church whose vital powers are paralyzed and frozen by schism, in which the clergy are brutal and ignorant, and a Synod, not necessarily composed of bishops, sways the course of ecclesiastical affairs in obedience to the State? How will such pastors prepare the minds of the rising generation to resist and repel the fallacies of atheists, nihilists, liberals, communists, wild sectaries, bible societies, Salvation Armies, and Protestants of every type and name? Will this effete schism of Photius, so far behind the rest of the world in culture and refinement, support the Tsar in his supreme conflict with democracy, whenever that shall arrive, or rather hang like a millstone round his neck and drag him into the dust? Even in respect of civilization the married clergy and the monks are plebeian and crass. It is fearful to think of the destiny of a flock of which the shepherds are so unfit to hold the rod and staff. The state of society appears to be exceedingly corrupt, if we may judge from the fact that during the past year the police arrested in St. Petersburg 82,243 persons, of whom 76,000 were men. This makes an average of 225 arrests per day. The clergy do not take, and are not fitted to take, the lead in the

education of the people. They are persecuted with reproaches and derision; they are constantly held up to ridicule. They do not introduce into the people the life of the Spirit of God; they rest in the dead forms of outward ceremonial, which they themselves often despise; the most scandalous tales are related in regard to their morals; their habits and companions are low; the sacraments fare badly by their administrations; their slovenly garb is a symbol of their inward disorder; they give false certificates to those who do not wish to partake of the Eucharist; they practise simony and give churches to their daughters as dowries. Many, it is true, are honest, respectable, and well-intentioned, but less learned and cultivated than the Catholic clergy.¹ Other reports, proceeding from different sources, are more favorable, and in all such cases one testimony should be balanced against another. M. Voitsechovich, Director of the Chancery of the Ober-Prokuror, said to Mr. Palmer: "You should go to Moscow, and to Kieff, to see the piety of the Russian people." He knew some places where the whole population communicated four times in the year, as the Church recommends, and there were more men than women in the churches. The outrages and massacres, however, committed recently on the Jews, give us anything but a favorable idea of the piety and intelligence of Muscovite Christians. The Princess Dolgorouky told Mr. Palmer there were women "who really do not know who our Lord is, or what He did for us, so that the brutalized state of the peasantry cannot be believed by those who have not had personal knowledge of it." Another priest with whom Mr. Palmer conversed was named Stratelatoff. He spoke much of the *Procession*, and said (in Latin): "Our doctrine is this: Spiritum sanctum in Patre *per* Filium procedere, and that from all eternity the Spirit is the proper Spirit of the Son, not communicated to Him; but immanent in Him as His own Spirit." If he had quoted the decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) he would have said: πιστεύομεν πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, πατρὶ καὶ ὕεω ὁμοούσιον.² The Archpriest, Kutnevich, conversed also with Mr. Palmer on doctrinal points, particularly the *Procession* and Transubstantiation. He also made many subtle distinctions, and stoutly maintained the exclusive orthodoxy of the Greco-Russian Church. A Russian lady, whom Mr. Palmer met at dinner, rated him in a most amusing manner on his attempt to obtain communion, of which she had heard. She declared it would "upset all Russia. And then," she asked, "what would the different ambassadors say? No, no; *des torrents de sang doivent couler, avant que cela ait lieu*. To give communion to you would be to give it to all your Church." This

¹ Wallace's Russia, i. 89-91.

² Schaff's Creeds, p. 401.

lady's fervor must have convinced him how small were his chances of success. Besides, how were M. de Barante and the rest of the Diplomatic Corps to be appeased?

M. Pafsky, Protopope—a very high-sounding office—of the Church of the Tauride palace, and preceptor to the Grand Duke Alexander, was a priest bewilderingly vague in his ideas of the visible unity of the Church. Even Mr. Palmer, in his Anglican days, was less foggy than he. Another priest, named Sidonsky, also a protopope and professor of philosophy, much read in German literature, said: “We have no *need* to examine or to settle that question of the *one* Visible Church of the Creed, and we never think about it.” He boasted, as did M. Pafsky, of their Church’s moderation and tolerance, saying, “they had been careful not to condemn others.” Mr. Palmer warned them, with good reason, that when they come to have free-thinking emperors, like Frederick the Great of Prussia, or Joseph II. of Austria, or liberal prime ministers, like Pombal; when infidels and sectarians of every kind and degree hurl themselves upon the Church, resolved to tear up its roots and break up its dominion, they will need to have examined every question concerning their claims on the obedience and confidence of their children. He spoke as if he had even then secret doubts himself of the tenability of any theory of Church government and Church unity except that maintained by the inviolate traditions of the Holy See. He was not particularly anxious to be presented to the Emperor Nicholas, though it was proposed to him that he should be. He would have been glad, if he had seen any sufficient reason for such a presentation, but he had no sort of public mission nor authority of any kind. He did not even represent his own college, much less the University of Oxford, and it was needful that he should be on his guard not to create a false impression. There were persons enough ready to speak of him as taking too much upon himself already, and appearing as a representative of others while, in fact, he represented none but himself. He had, afterwards, reason to feel satisfied with his decision in this matter, which showed on his part both prudence and modesty. He came at last to look back on his request for communion in Russia as a craze; he spoke of it in this manner to the writer, at Rome, in 1856; and as such it could not but be regarded by Greco-Russians, Anglicans, and Catholics alike. Nicholas could have but smiled at his petition, and looked upon him as a learned oddity.

Towards the end of October Mr. Palmer removed to the house of a young priest named Fortunatoff, to live with him in the suburbs, across the Neva. The description he gives of his lodging is somewhat picturesque. “My room,” he writes, “is about ten

feet square. A long chest, between two and three feet high, lengthened out by a chair, is the bedstead; on this is a straw mattress; one very narrow sheet and a light counterpane; my carpet bag serves for a pillow, and the scarceness of bedclothes is remedied by my wadded cloak. The window is very small, double of course, incapable of opening in winter; ventilation by opening the door, and by the stove, which is heated every other day and makes the room at first much too hot, fumes from the charcoal often causing headache, in consequence of the wood not being equally burned before the tube was closed. The first night I slept not a wink; when I confessed this to a priest, he said, 'I guess what it is;' and taking a lighted tallow candle, he examined the crevices and corners of the room, and found long clusters of vermin wedged in and hanging together like bees in a hive. They fizzled and fell into the candle, and almost put it out. This clearance is no doubt much, but still my nights are bad enough. There is a shallow round brass pan set on a chair for washing; a great bottle of water, a drinking glass, a candlestick, a small deal table at the window, a second chair and an old cupboard complete the furniture. Cleaning of shoes or washing of linen there is none; but as I went on Saturdays to the English lodging house, and stayed there over Sunday, I used to take my linen there, and get my shoes cleaned, if that was needed."

It cannot, we think, be tiresome to continue this extract, which concerns the diet to which Mr. Palmer was treated in his singular abode. "In the morning, when it was not a fast, the Finnish girl used to bring me a tumbler of tea with sugar—or two, if I called for a second, and a piece of bread; on festivals, sweet-bread, and there was always raw smoked or salted fish, and bread and Dutch cheese—the latter here a luxury, to be had if called for. We dined all together, the priest, his wife, and often a younger sister of hers, and myself, at four o'clock. After dinner they take a cup of coffee, and sleep for an hour or two, being very early risers, and about 8 P.M. we again have a glass, never a cup, of tea. . . . The chief articles of food at table were these: soup, with which we always began, as in France; black rye bread, white bread also; red cabbage, slightly salted, cut into shreds; sweetmeats, made of a coarse berry of a dull red color, and of other berries, which they eat with meat; meat and game, especially ptarmigans, and the largest kind of grouse, the capercalzie, which is very abundant; cakes of millet; a jelly made of potato flour and syrup of cranberries, eaten with sugar and milk. The only vegetable besides the red cabbage and potatoes was small salted cucumbers. On Wednesdays and Fridays and other fast days there was neither flesh meat nor milk, butter, cheese nor eggs; but fish soup and fish, caviare, almond

milk, linseed or nut oil, mushrooms, and several kinds of the edible toadstools. Thin slices of lemon were often put into the tea instead of milk on fast days. To drink there was the water of the Neva, not always over-clear, and quass, and occasionally, on any special day, a bottle of port wine or of porter. *Pirogi*, a sort of sandwich—meat, fish, or sweetmeat, between two sides of baked pastry—and an open tartlet, formed a second course. A favorite and most agreeable drink was infusion of cranberries sweetened, which is also thought to be a specific in cases of internal fever."

It is evident, from many of Mr. Palmer's experiences more than forty years ago, that infidelity was on the move and advancing in those spheres in which it is wont to reign. The priest Fortunatoff told him that in the university the profesors and students were all free thinkers, and that the physicians and medical professors and students were all unbelieving to a man. Such sweeping generalizations must always be accepted with allowance, yet it is to be remembered that many of them are German Lutherans, and still more Lutheranised or Germanised. M. Fortunatoff was persuaded that medical men must be skeptics everywhere. "Here in Russia, at any rate," he said, "they are all unbelievers and never communicate in all their lives. Doctors are never punished for being excommunicated. Ah! *Pessimi sunt*." He had much also to say against the nobles, but this may have been due in part to the fact of the priests never visiting them and very rarely visiting the merchants and citizens either. Dispraise of the Frenchified or Germanized nobles was often accompanied by praise of peasant piety. It could not be said of the rural population that they were quite against all ceremonies as superstitions, and that they respect neither the saints nor their *icons*. Indeed there were many mujiks (peasants) who called every unmeaning wood-cut alike *bojinka*—"little god." As to the Russian ladies, Lady Bloomfield says "they never appeared to occupy themselves, and their chief interest was the theatre; their first question invariably was, what plays had I seen?"¹ Whatever way we look, there has been little satisfaction to be found in the condition of Russian society from the years in which Mr. Palmer visited the country, in 1840-41, to the period of Mr. Wallace's residence, 1870-75, on to the time still recent when Muscovite bigotry, cruelty, and avarice were, in their most brutal forms, let loose on masses of unresisting Israelites. Mr. Wallace usually writes with the wish apparently to be accurate and impartial, and he, in speaking of one important part of the ecclesiastical system of Russia, says: "My personal acquaintance with the Russian monasteries is too slight to enable me to speak with authority regarding their actual condition, but I may say that during casual

¹ Court and Diplomatic Life, vol. i. p. 146.

visits to some of them I have always been disagreeably impressed by the vulgar commercial spirit which seemed to reign in the place. Several of them have appeared to me little better than houses of refuge for the indolent, and I have had on more than one occasion good grounds for concluding that among monks, as among ordinary mortals, indolence leads to drunkenness and other vices. If there is anything that may be called party-feeling in the Russian Church, it is the feeling of hostility which exists between the white and the black clergy, that is to say, between the parish priests and the monks. The parish priests consider it very hard that they should have nearly all the laborious duties and none of the honors of their profession. The monks, on the other hand, look on the parish priest as a kind of ecclesiastical half-caste, and think that he ought to obey his superiors without grumbling."

As an instance of severity in civil administration, combined with frightful abuse of a Church sacrament, it may be mentioned that if a man is banished to Siberia for life, after three years his wife is at liberty to marry again. The hollow pretensions of cosmopolitan half-culture, and the sad want of thoroughness that prevails in Russian society, are ably depicted in Turgenieff's masterly novels and novelettes, which all appear in the French language.

Among the most singular of Mr. Palmer's acquaintances was John Veniamineff, missionary to the Aleutian Islands in the North Pacific. He came from Irkoutsk, and his mission was supported by the Russian American Company. Ten thousand of the inhabitants out of sixty thousand had become Christians. The previous missionary, Macarius, had known nothing of their language and had stayed among them only a year. Veniamineff's children were all born in the islands, but at last he sent them with his wife to Irkoutsk for education. In the islands he made all his own furniture; and when he had thoroughly learned the language he translated some of the Church prayers, the Catechism and the Gospel of St. Matthew, which was printed in Slavonian letters. During the first seven years he conversed with the natives and taught them through an interpreter employed by the Russian American Company. His services were in Slavonic, he had a reader or singer, who was a Russian, and a native priest. The people communicated once in about two years, as the missionary could not visit all the islands oftener. Great crimes, it was said, were unknown among them, and they seemed to be the mildest, most virtuous, simple, inoffensive, and submissive people on earth, wonderfully patient, and often going days without food. Admiral Ricard reported one old native to have been supernaturally instructed. Angels in white clothes (whom he called men) used to appear to him. They instructed the old man in the Scriptures, but there seems to have

been some confusion between the words angels and men. When M. Veniamineff came in contact with Mr. Palmer he was dressed in cotton velvet, and wore a gold pectoral cross and a red ribbon. He had a rough, weather-beaten look, but one that bespoke a simple, decided, and practical character. He had forgotten his Latin, and the Potemkins interpreted for him. The conversion of pagans like the Aleutians would be easy if the spoiled children of civilization would only leave them to the gentle influences of the Gospel, as taught in its entirety and purity by Catholic missionaries.

The well-intentioned Veniamineff is afterwards spoken of as a bishop having four or five (Russian) churches in his diocese. Mr. Palmer's interview with the Metropolitan Archbishop of Moscow, Philaret, could, of course, bring but one result. The application was made distinctly, and the grounds were very clearly stated, but this made its essential weakness and untenability the more apparent. Mr. Palmer afterwards admitted that the decision was just. He had no sort of claim to communion with the Metropolitan of the Russian Church, and he had no means of realizing communion with the Catholic Church except by reconciliation with the centre of unity in the See of Rome.

The object of Cardinal Newman in editing the long-buried manuscript of his friend could not have been by any means exclusively ecclesiastical. It has literary merits and social bearings. Some of its descriptions are worthy of any traveller, and present the objects described in a very clear light. Mr. Palmer had been recommended to seek another interview with the Metropolitan Archbishop, and this entailed another journey of 525 English miles. It is far from possessing the exciting interest of Captain Burnaby's "Ride to Khiva," but passages such as the following will always be read with pleasure.

"There is little to notice on the journey, except the long black-looking villages, which lie along the road at intervals. The houses are made of trunks of trees, roughly squared, and let into each other, plastered within, but not without. The gable of the house almost always fronts the road, and the roof, which is of boards and very high, projects some way over the walls, affording a shelter from rain or sun in summer, and shooting off the snow in winter. These houses by no means betoken poverty; on the contrary, they are more substantial, warmer, and larger than any houses of our peasantry in England. Indeed, that sort of poverty which abounds with us cannot be said to exist in Russia. The peasants, whom we suppose to be wretched slaves, answer rather to our small farmers, or copyhold tenants, than to day-laborers or paupers. They have all from sixteen to twenty acres of land, with horse and cart, sheep and other live stock, with a long range of outhouses

running back behind each cottage for hay, wood, and the lodging of cattle in winter. This they hold, free of other rent, by a service of three days' labor in the week to the lord—a service which is often commuted for an annual money payment."

The famous edicts for the emancipation of serfs were issued, it must be remembered, in 1861, just twenty years after the date of the journey of Mr. Palmer here described. He goes on to say:

"The ends of the houses toward the road are a good deal ornamented, and with their high roofs look not only picturesque but pretty, often having as many as three galleries or balconies of palings across, besides an ornamental board or bar just under the angle of the roof. The woodwork of these palings, as well as the projecting edges of the roof and the shutters of the windows, which fold back without, is often much indented and cut, so as almost to resemble a lace pattern. On the other hand, the extent of the out-houses behind, often very roughly put together, and of dead paling between every two houses, all black, like the houses themselves, from the weather, certainly presents rather a gloomy and squalid aspect, and contrasts strangely with the bright, clean, whitewashed walls and green cupolas, domes, and roofs of the church or churches, and with the red-brick and whitewash of the government offices, and perhaps of the hotel. The road from St. Petersburg to Moscow is magnificent in its width and keeping, and in the granite bridges which one passes at different places; but of scattered houses or cross-roads we see absolutely none except here and there perhaps a mere cart rut near a village. Our way ran through two uniform lines of forest of birch and pine, through which a wide space has been cut and left bare. This at the time looked wild enough, but on my return from Moscow it was one vast carpet of flowers of the brightest colors."

Mr. Palmer's visit to the grand old city which Russia once offered for her own redemption caused him many serious reflections on the fate of the Patriarchate and episcopal authority in the hands of the Tsar. When Peter the Great, it is said, had long kept the Patriarchal see vacant, and contemplated the institution of the Synod in place of the Patriarchate, he was one day reminded of his duty in the Church of the Assumption by Stephen Yavonky, Metropolitan of Riazan and guardian of the patriarchal see during the vacancy. "This prelate, pointing to the patriarchal chair, remarked that 'his Majesty might as well have it broken up and removed, if no one were to sit in it,' to which Peter replied: 'That chair is not for Stephen to sit on; but neither is it for Peter to break.'" Thinking of this story, Mr. Palmer, when one day re-visiting this church, saw a man kneeling at the tomb of one of the patriarchs, his hands clasped, his face buried in them, and resting upon the rail which

protects the coffin, absorbed apparently in some deep feeling. The traveller then fell into a reverie not to be wondered at considering his antecedents and peculiar line of reading at Oxford. Was not that worshipper at the tomb lamenting the past, and praying to God "that the government of his country might repent of having withdrawn itself so far from the advice and blessing of the Church; that it may publicly retract the unhallowed assumption made by Peter; that it may return from its eager pursuit after the infidel civilization of the West, and replace itself in that attitude of filial affection and reverence towards the hierarchy it once exhibited under the Tsar Michael, the first of the Romanoffs, and son of the great Patriarch Philaret? or again, may it be that he is confessing and deploring that sinful jealousy which moved the Russian nobility to urge or force their sovereigns in former times to strip the Church of her worldly property, and to break her power, without perceiving that they were thereby destroying that spiritual balance and check which alone secured the Tsar from being a mere despot, or from being a mere representative of base popular appetite or interest, so that the nobles might neither be slaves and tools on the one hand, nor masters of their sovereign under the hypocritical name of his ministers on the other?"

To judge from some little that we have seen of the Greco-Russian ritual, and much more by what we have read and heard, the "liturgy" and other services of its churches must have a certain charm for those who are accustomed to worship in them. Though far less animated than our own, they have an imprint totally distinct from the rationalistic and worldly aspect of Protestant novelties. They are manifestly ancient in their origin, oriental, mysterious and sacrificial in their character. They speak of Christ and the saints, the Holy Mother, and the Jewish Church. Lady Bloomfield has seized many strong points in a page written to describe a midnight Mass on Christmas Eve in the Winter Palace of the Tsar on April 3, 1847. The Emperor and Empress were not able to attend, but "I was allowed," she writes, "to go to a gallery, which commanded a view of the chapel. The body of the church was completely filled with officers of State and the whole Court in full dress. As soon as the Czarewitch and other members of the Imperial family appeared, the service began by the choristers heading a procession followed by the priests, who carried the icons, and these were followed by the Imperial family. After having traversed the principal apartments the procession re-entered the chapel, and vespers began. Soon after midnight the Metropolitan left the altar bearing a gold jewelled crucifix, with which he first made the sign of the cross, and then presented it to the Czarewitch, who kissed it, and then embraced the Metropolitan on both cheeks. The priests wore the

same gorgeous vestments they had on at the christening, and each carried either a folio bound in gold and inlaid with pictures, or else an icon. The Czarewitch approached each and kissed them, as he had done the Metropolitan, and he was followed by the Grand Duchess Maria and the rest of the Imperial family. When the Emperor comes to the ceremony he is embraced by all present, from the first to the last, and this takes several hours; but as this is only an act of fealty to the reigning sovereign, it did not take place in his absence; but as soon as the Imperial family returned to their places Mass was said. People congratulated each other on Christ being risen, and much embracing went on; but I retired about two o'clock, before the service was quite over. The chapel was brilliantly illuminated, and the *coup d'œil* was very fine indeed. When the Bible was read the Metropolitan stood at the altar within the doors; but three other reading desks were placed at the different sides of the chapel, and the priests read from them alternately, which typified the preaching of the Gospel throughout the world."

From what small beginnings has many a great library sprung! A Greek MS. brought by Sophia, wife of John III., from Greece or Italy has grown at last into what is now the Patriarchal Library. The learned Greek Maximus was amazed at its richness when he was sent for to Mount Athos by Basil, the son of Sophia, to sort and arrange the MSS. This was about the time that James II. of England was running his brief career as king. The collection thus made under Sophia and Basil was afterwards enlarged by the Patriarch Nikon, who sent the monk Souchanoff to Mount Athos and to the East, with directions to search all the monasteries, and to bring back whatever he could procure in the way of valuable books and MSS. Souchanoff collected, accordingly, as many as 500 Greek books from Mount Athos, and the Greek Patriarchs supplied him with 200 more. Much has been lost, and what remains needs to be arranged; yet it constitutes one of the richest collections known; and it was said that when the MSS. were catalogued by Professor Mattei, he showed astonishment like that of Maximus at the number and rarity of the treasures unfolded to his view. When, in Mr. Palmer's time, some members of the University of Oxford requested a collation of some MSS. of St. Chrysostom, the collators, M. Kyriakoff and another, courteously declined receiving anything for their trouble except a copy of the New Edition of that work of the Saint in which the result of their assistance should appear.

There are in Russia only three Lavras or first-class monasteries: that of St. Sergius, or the Moscow Lavra; St. Alexander Nefski, or the St. Petersburg; and that of Kieff, where are bodies said to have remained incorrupt about 600 years by reason of their

sanctity of life and singular piety towards God. Cardinal Lambertini, however, held that their incorruption, taken by itself, was not to be accounted a miracle. However this question be decided, the reputation of the three saints just mentioned for sanctity is supported in many ways, and that of St. Sergius owes much to Mouravieff's "Church History" and the notes on it by Mr. Blackmore. He appears to have been a hermit residing in the thick woods, and drawing disciples around him in the midst of all manner of temptation. It was in visiting this Troitsa or great Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius that Mr. Palmer fell in with groups of pilgrims along the whole line of the road from Moscow to the monastery. Many also were returning from Troitsa.

"In all there were, I should think, several thousand, and quite as many women as men. They seemed to wear a peculiar dress of a whitish-brown color, the head, chin and face bound and muffled up in a handkerchief, a jacket or smock covering their body and reaching barely to the knees, while the legs were clad in wrappers, with either bare feet or else shoes of bark, or sandals. Many groups we had passed reclining in the shade of trees and resting, others walking in a body, others scattered irregularly in long lines of twos and threes, and single stragglers at intervals. . . . The outer gates were thronged with a dense crowd of peasants, as were also the courts of the monasteries within, and the avenues of lime trees, and the porches and approaches of all the churches. Many of them asked alms, and there sat along the broad walk and avenues long lines of beggars on either side, many with their hats or caps in their laps, showing in the crowns all that they had received; and some had a good heap of coppers; nor did it seem to strike them that, having received so much, they were any the less likely for showing it to receive more. One man, whose heap seemed one of the largest, being asked to give change for a piece of silver and keep himself a halfpenny, gave the change immediately with abundance of thanks. Some, too, assisted their less fortunate brethren, who were blind, to beg, or turned attention towards them in a very amiable manner. All the pilgrims who had come from any distance had a staff in their hands and a wallet over their shoulders; and many, they said, had walked hither from very distant provinces—some even from Siberia."

The Archimandrite-Rector, Philaret, who was Mr. Palmer's host at the Spiritual Academy, and afterwards became Bishop of Riga, was remarkable for having, in the course of a few years, received into the Orthodox Church as many as 80,000 or 100,000 Lettish Lutherans. These peasants had, during centuries, been oppressed by their German lords, and had little sympathy with their German

pastors. For some time they had been in a state of excitement, and reports had been circulated that, if they would join the Orthodox Church, the Government would improve their actual condition as regarded the lords of the soil, or would remove them, and give them lands and freedom elsewhere. The Bishop of Riga, being complained of as encouraging proselytism, was removed and sent into a monastery, but Philaret, the Rector of the Spiritual Academy at the Troitsa, set to work, as soon as he was consecrated to the See of Riga, and gave a favourable direction to the movement he found existing in the Lettish peasantry. He opened conferences, not without effect, with some of the Moravian pastors, translated the Catechism into the Lettish dialect, and began to translate the Liturgy, or Mass, and to train priests and deacons who might be able to officiate and preach among these peasants in their own language. The complaints of the nobility and their pastors, though strong and numerous, were this time unsuccessful. The Russian Government allowed things to take their course, and, notwithstanding extravagant reports, raised by Prussian and German newspapers, of compulsion, oppression and bigotry, an *oukaz* was issued, which, while it allowed the conversions to go on, provided that no Lettish peasant should be received into the Orthodox Church who had not, six months previously, signed a public declaration of his intention. But, in spite of this discouragement, the movement continued to spread, year after year, and in some places the whole population of a village met together in the church, and took a solemn farewell forever of Luther and his "Reformation." A friend wrote to Mr. Palmer that Count Pratasoff, the Ober-Prokuror, who has been spoken of before in this article, spoke of the conversions in Livonia, and seemed in high spirits about it. "They are going on," he said, "faster than ever; thousands are inscribing their names on the list every month, and the whole number already received into the Church amounts to 72,000." The Government was, for some time, embarrassed to find them priests and churches, and on that account moderated rather than hastened the movement.

Up to the time of Mr. Palmer's visit to Russia, the national character appeared to be tinged with humility, brotherly kindness, warm feeling and reverence, and it is probable that many traces of these would still be observed, especially in the country. Pride and *egoism* will spread among them as they have spread among ourselves, exactly in proportion to the rapidity of the advance of unbelief and democracy. Mr. Palmer gives a few illustrations of this subject which are worth recalling.

"One captain," he says, "in the American service (they are our

children) wrote to the Government that it did not seem consistent with the dignity of a democratic citizen to follow the universal custom to take off his hat on meeting the Emperor. 'However,' said he, 'the Emperor met me in the street, and saved me the trouble of deciding the question, for he took off his own hat to me. I suppose he saw I was a stranger.'" In the "Handbook for Northern Europe," the author, speaking of the Nicholas Gate of the Kremlin, which it is customary to pass bareheaded, says: "Many Englishmen have *made a point of honor* of walking on as if ignorant of the custom, until stopped by the sentinel." We have sometimes asked members of the Established Church whether they conformed on some occasion with this or that innocent Catholic usage, and have been answered with a smile or a sneer,—“Not I.” But this sort of behavior is neither wise nor amiable.

Mr. Palmer was not troubled, like so many of his countrymen, with any pious horror and pity of the icons of the Russians. He thoroughly embraced the doctrine of the communion and the invocation of saints, and had no scruples at all about addressing them with direct, poetical, rhetorical, and spiritual invocations; not, as he very accurately expressed it, “as if they were naturally or bodily present to hear us, but as speaking to them only *in* Christ and *in* God, who may give us for our addresses the same benefit as if the saints were naturally present to hear.” There can be no doubt that this spiritual wisdom, on his part, was among the many causes which led on to Mr. Palmer's entering ultimately the true Fold, and thus obtaining a grace far beyond any which communion with Eastern patriarchs could have procured.

Before quitting the neighborhood of Moscow, the traveller first visited the Monastery of the Resurrection or New Jerusalem (Voskresensk), founded by the Patriarch Nikon. It is very prettily situated on a hill, with groves around, and a winding river. It was an object of peculiar interest; its sacred buildings were a model of the holy places at Jerusalem. “The approach is by a long avenue of trees; its walls are from twenty-five to thirty-five feet high, and rise finely out of the hill, with eight or nine good-looking towers at intervals, and another of rather fantastic appearance, higher than the rest.” There one may visit, as it were, all the holy places, contained under one roof, to which pilgrims resort in Jerusalem, without departing from the neighborhood of Moscow.

The bitter climate of Russia, its long winter and intense frosts, has not deprived it of all natural beauty. When we read this highly intelligent traveller's description of Gortilitsa, a seat which once belonged to the Empress Elizabeth, we well imagine it the fondling of more genial suns and more balmy winds. “The house,

or houses, connected by a verandah, were surrounded by a very large court with a tuft of garden or shrubbery in the middle. The gardens on the other side were in English style, with a deep valley, a trout stream, cascades, fountains, grottoes, and lakes—sometimes three visible at once—hills and woods. Nothing could be prettier. . . . The day before my arrival they killed a huge bear, shooting him as he was splashing the water into his face in the lake. The hills all round the village were covered with beds of strawberries, which the villagers take to St. Petersburg in great quantities to sell. The woods also abound with them wild."

We must now draw towards a conclusion our abstract of this most interesting journey. Mr. Palmer had—as Cardinal Newman well knew—a rare power of building on a slender foundation a magnificent superstructure of brilliant matter. It was on the 24th of July, 1841, that, having taken leave of all his Russian friends in the most friendly manner, and having received from many members of the Synod the strongest assurance of the pleasure they had derived from his visit and conversations, Mr. Blackmore, also, having delivered to him his translation of Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church" to revise and publish in England, he left for his home, by way of Lubeck and Hamburg, and was in Oxford once more a few days after reaching England. We need not apologize for concluding with an extract from a sermon preached in New York by the late Dean Stanley on All Saints' Day, 1878. The defective character of his theology is admitted, but he was a man of greatness of observation and reflection, and the passage will be found strikingly illustrative of Mr. Palmer's book. He was speaking, according to his wont, of the four Churches of Christendom, and extending yet more widely the tripartite division of Mr. Palmer in his Oxford days. "We know," he said, "how in a family we sometimes see four brothers or cousins, each of the most different character from the other. We might wish sometimes that they were all exactly alike, but God has made them different, and it is their very difference which makes them to be of use to each other. One of them is much older than the rest, grave, perhaps stiff and reserved, unwilling to move; looking at the more eager sports and pursuits of the younger members of the family calmly, kindly, forbearingly; not adding much to their amusement, or advancement, or instruction, but telling them from time to time a word of wise counsel, and telling them of the manners and customs of the good old times, which, but for his tenacious memory and older years, would be quite forgotten. That is the position of the ancient Eastern or Greek Churches, which are found in Asia, Egypt, Greece, and Russia. They have for many hundreds of years done but

little for the knowledge or activity of the world. But they represent, more than any other set of Christians now existing, the usages of older days. They have handed down to us creeds and ancient forms which without them would have been lost. They look upon all younger Churches more kindly and gently, perhaps, than any of those younger Churches look upon them and on each other. They are quite unlike us. We never could adapt ourselves to their religious customs, nor they to ours. But for that very reason we can regard them with respectful gratitude; and the very remoteness of their position and their manners from us makes us feel more forcibly the examples of Christian wisdom and Christian faith which we may find amongst them. Such was the answer of the Eastern Patriarchs in a letter sent to the Pope of Rome: 'Let us love one another in order that we may be able with one accord to worship God.' Such was the letter of the Patriarch of Constantinople a few years later: 'Let us approach the subject which you bring before us by historical methods.' Such, in the great empire of Russia, was the good old Archbishop of Moscow who died some few years ago. Such was the character of the Russian Admiral Kornileff, who fell in the siege of Sebastopol. We see, in all these, features of the same Christian family as ourselves, yet with a peculiar primitive expression, a quiet strength, which we could hardly have found outside of those old Churches. That is the eldest brother of our household." No reader can be misled by the doctrinal error of this passage, after all that has been said of the long and deplorable schism of the Greek Church.

A GRANDDAUGHTER OF JOSEPH DE MAISTRE.

Vie de la Mère Thérèse de Jésus (Xavérine de Maistre), par M. l'abbé Houssaye. Terminée et publiée par Mgr. Charles Gay. Paris: Oudin, éditeur. 1882.

IN the life before us St. Augustine's commentary on the Psalmist's words, *audi, filia, et vide*, seems to be fully borne out. A true intelligence of the truths of the faith breeds piety and spiritual sight after a manner compatible with this world of exile, and on these grounds the granddaughter of Joseph de Maistre of Catholic fame could claim that exuberance of understanding which is early produced in a household where reign faith's powerful traditions. Whether strong natures are born or made is a point which still awaits treatment and development, and whether without that early atmosphere of sound teaching, and hardy nurture in the belief of things unseen, Xavérine de Maistre would still have been the remarkable character which she was, is a question involving the vast subject of native worth as opposed to the outward influences of training and education. However that may be, to the soil must, in great part at least, be attributed the excellence and beauty of the flower.

Marie Xavérine Joséphine Ignace was the tenth child of Count Rodolph de Maistre, son of Joseph de Maistre, the well-known Catholic champion. At the time of her birth, on April 17, 1838, her father occupied the post of governor of Nice, and it was accordingly to the ancient cathedral church of Sta. Reparata in the old town that she was carried, when four hours old, for holy baptism. In privileged lives more especially the child is the measure of the man. The two prevailing sentiments of Xavérine's childhood were love of God and love of penance. The former intensified her natural affections, whilst the latter was the germ which contained the future immolation of Carmel. She seemed, indeed, to love God spontaneously, without any of that painful process which is apt to make souls who are striving after divine delights inaccessible and cold to human affection. Her biographer recounts at one and the same time her devotedness to her mother and her extraordinary acts of penance. Whilst she would leave her play to seek out some heavy burden for her shoulders which should remind her of the Cross, and wear freshly gathered roses with their thorns in her dress, she would also impose upon herself the mortification of not looking at her mother for several hours

together. One Good Friday, noticing that all her family were practicing mortification in some way or other, she was quite distressed to be alone doing nothing. Our Lady, to whom she confided her trouble, gave her an inspiration in accordance with which the child passed a portion of the night in prayer holding her hands crossed over her head. The thought of Our Lord's sufferings pierced her to the heart, and at times caused her tears to flow. On one occasion, a priest who saw her thus, as he thought, silent and preoccupied, administered a sharp reprimand for her sulkiness. Xavérine bore the correction without excusing herself, and was consoled interiorly by grace.

The traditions which Joseph de Maistre had bequeathed to his posterity were worthily perpetuated in Count Rodolph's family. Xavérine's sisters were chosen souls whose lives were guided by the light of faith, and amongst them Francesca, the eldest, was an extraordinary example of penance, one of those whose whole being speaks of little else but Jesus Crucified. Her place would have seemed to be in a convent, yet she had tried her vocation and failed. As a compensation for the religious life she undertook terrible penances, the traces of which she bore on her pale and emaciated countenance. It was to Francesca that the Comtesse de Maistre entrusted the care of Xavérine's first Communion, which great act the child accomplished on March 25th, 1847, that is to say, before she was quite nine years old.

Readers of those delightful pages entitled "Correspondance Inédite de Joseph de Maistre," will remember the aspirations of his daughter Constance and the Count's own preference for the *sublime féminin*. She afterwards married the Duc de Laval-Montmorency, who was consequently brother-in-law to Xavérine's father. When in 1848 Count Rodolph left Nice, he established himself for a time at Borgo, the Duke's magnificent seat in North Piedmont. It was there, on June 20th, that Benedicta de Maistre married Count Medolago Albani, thus making the first breach in the family circle. Her departure from home seems not to have left too great a vacuum in Xavérine's heart, for in her sister Philomena she found an entire community of age and tastes, a sympathy as perfect as may be enjoyed here on earth. After some struggle with herself she determined to share Francesca's arduous work of visiting the poor, and with the impetuosity of her nature she added practices of supererogation to the sacrifice itself. She was not contented with merely going to them. In order to obtain abundant grace for them she would put little pebbles into her shoes, or thorns, which drew blood, into her stockings. Her independence of character asserted itself both at study and at play. She did not like books, and it was only her love of God which made her faithful to

her lessons. "Play is all I care for," she one day remarked in reply to an enquiry as to her favorite occupation. At the same time this very natural bent supplied her with matter for sacrifice. The sisters were fond of acting charades together for the benefit of the family. One day, however, nothing would induce Xavérine to take a part, and she could not be brought to explain her refusal. Philomena at length succeeded in eliciting her reasons. "I found," she said, "that I liked it too much; all the time in church I was thinking what we could do that would be nice, and it distracted me. So, as it prevents me from praying, I intend to give it up." And the child was faithful to that inward light which was perpetually leading the way to penance.

In 1851 the death of the Duc de Montmorency wrought a change in the domestic circle of the De Maistres by giving them a French home. The Duke bequeathed his fortune to Count Rodolph, with all its obligations, but some time elapsed before they established themselves at Beaumesnil, his magnificent Norman château, which supplied Xavérine with a fruitful battle-field. In the meantime Count Rodolph was anxious that his daughters should profit by a temporary stay in Paris in order to go through a course of catechism. Family life as it was carried out in their house was no mean preparation for the discipline either of the world or the cloister. The morning was devoted to study. After luncheon the young girls took their work whilst their mother or one of their aunts read aloud some instructive book. The fine arts filled up the afternoon. It is curious that in spite of the silent pleadings of grace in her heart and of her future vocation, Xavérine, not Philomena, should have been accessible to vanity, but so it was. Humility, wrongly understood, is depressing because it reveals us to ourselves as we should be without God's good gifts, and makes us feverishly eager to cover a nakedness which is more apparent than real. Xavérine had no natural aptitude for study, but she greatly depreciated her capacity, and supposing herself to be very dull, she attached herself rather to her outward appearance. That at least was attractive, she thought, and with truth. When she wanted any matter of dress, her plan was to urge Philomena to ask for it for them both. Philomena, however, had no desires of the kind, and Xavérine would punish her either by a few angry words or a moody silence.

As early as August, 1851, the young Countess Medolago (Benedita de Maistre) had been taken from her husband and little boy. The Count, in turning his thoughts to a second marriage, fixed upon his sister-in-law, Philomena, as the kindest mother for Stanislaus, and thus the hour of real separation struck for Xavérine. The nuptial ceremony took place in Piedmont, after which Xavé-

rine returned to her home, and for the first time laid herself out in kindness and devotedness to her father and mother. A few months later Count Medolago himself was carried off by cholera, and Philomena found herself at liberty to return, for a time, to her family. Xavérine's attraction for penance was becoming more and more marked. She was no longer satisfied with rising at night to pray, and mortifying herself at meals, but conceived an intense desire to imitate the great examples of austerity suggested to her by reading the Lives of the Saints. Once, in particular, she had been told of the invention of dropping hot sealing-wax on the flesh and allowing it to fester. Accordingly Countess Medolago one day found her practising this penance upon herself, and she was only stopped by Philomena's threat to do likewise.

God's ways are inscrutable. It is not for us to say why He leads some souls rejoicing up the steep ascent of Carmel, and allows others, on the contrary, to bruise and tear their flesh in the thorns by the way. In the ordinary course of things, if we may so speak of the life of grace, penance rejoices the soul, and perhaps we have all been struck by Fr. Faber's remark that the discipline was productive of good spirits. God's reward to Xavérine de Maistre for the ardor of her maidenhood was one after His own Heart. It was suffering, less indeed outward trials than the shadow of her Lord's terrible agony in the garden, interior desolation, the dark night of the soul which has no dawn but eternity. Those who have grasped the full meaning of the law of compensation and in the supernatural order the heinousness of one mortal sin, will alone have the clue to a life such as that of Xavérine de Maistre. As long as there are men and women on earth who live, love, and breathe only for the world and the flesh, there must be others whose whole existence is one act of faith and charity in things divine. Whilst, indeed, the work of St. Vincent's daughters is fairly understood, even by unbelievers, it is not unfrequent to hear Catholics themselves speaking of the purely contemplative life as of a thing which baffles them. They fail to realize the great idea of expiation and to ponder sufficiently upon those words of St. Paul which point out one of the dangers of active good works :

Si distribuero in cibos pauperum omnes facultates meas, et si tradidero corpus meum ita ut ardeam, charitatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest. Who better understands charity than the nun who loves God so well that she sacrifices herself every hour of the day for those whom He loves?

For Xavérine de Maistre the holy mountain of Carmel was all painful. It had only appeared on the distant horizon of her life, and already it seemed to be God's will to take the sweetness, not

only out of created things, but even out of the sacrifices which she made for Him.

As she was driving in an open carriage with her father from Borgo to Bergamo in the early spring of 1856, the horses took fright and they were both thrown. In her anxiety about her father Xavérine forgot herself till she tried to walk, when she found she could not stand on her feet. She was carried to her bed, where she spent three months as a preparation for a state of sickness and suffering which terminated only with her life. In her ardor she began to *desire* that inward desolation of which she had already tasted, as a means of uniting herself more intimately with Our Lord's Passion; and not content with the pains He had laid upon her, she continued her voluntary penances, calling her sister Philomena to her assistance when her own powers of invention failed.

To a soul whom God leads along extraordinary paths a director would seem to be almost indispensable, and hitherto, thanks to her wanderings and her timidity, Xavérine had not met with a guide. It was in Rome, whither the Jubilee of 1858 had attracted the De Maistres, that she first began to be indulged with what is called direction. By degrees she opened her heart to a Canon of Sant' Eustachio, Dom Bertinelli, who continued to be God's instrument in her behalf till the hour of sacrifice had struck. A letter of Xavérine's to her sister Philomena, written shortly before this Roman visit, will convey a good notion of her feelings and state of mind: "*Cristo crocifisso, ed io fra le delizie!* You may say what you like, darling, it's no less true that this ejaculation of Muzzarelli was made for me. Mamma told you about the beginning of my illness, which lasted a week, during which time I did not suffer; but I was warmer than my wont. . . . I stayed in bed six hours longer than usual; my bed was warmed; I lunched, comfortably established on the sofa; I ate a great deal of rice and cooked fruit, because it is my favorite food; at night I drank orange-flower water, kissing Our Lord's wounds and telling myself that He had had nothing but vinegar. I made only half an hour's meditation, and wrote no letters. . . . I say no more, for it would take too long to tell you of all my *delizie*, but this is chiefly what filled up my week's illness. In the intervals I had oppression, shiverings, palpitations. I hope that you won't grumble to-day at my silence about my health, and that you will grow more and more convinced *che i miei mali non son altro che delizie, e vuol pazienza.*"

Later on she writes to the same sister an amusing account of a chance confessor who had questioned her as to her state: "The other day, as I was going to confession, I was asked by way of a hint for my direction whether I was *maritata* or *da maritare*. I

could not help jumping at the latter question, and crying out *no, no, no!* But the confessor, nothing daunted, calmly answered *Dunque è maritata!* I was obliged to say 'No' more decidedly, and then he made me own to being in the first position, for he doesn't admit of a third state. Isn't it amusing?"

It was the March after Xavérine's arrival in Rome that she had the first touch of real desolation. For a week she could do nothing but cry and groan over her misery to God. The thought of confession and Communion troubled her to the marrow of her bones. "I am so bad," she wrote to Dom Bertinelli, "that I wish some one would forbid me the Sacraments." Her director, however, spoke only words of comfort, telling her that her life ought to be a continual thanksgiving for the graces which were lavished upon her.

A little higher up the mountain which was leading her to the laborious rest of the prophets, she made one of those prayers to God which it belongs not to worldly philosophy to understand. Again the terrible drought passed over her soul, taking the savor and the joy out of those things she loved best, and she was moved to offer herself as willing and ready to accomplish God's will with repugnance for the rest of her days. Her prayer was heard. She loved God with the purity of an angel for all the sweetness, tenderness, and even peace of piety were taken away, and in this state of aridity and natural repulsion she accomplished her sacrifices.

In July, 1859, she was taken by her mother and Francesca to Louèche to try the effect of the baths, her father and mother being naturally alarmed at her very deplorable state of health. Louèche was an ordeal. It benefited neither soul nor body in the material sense. Her spiritual nature was as nervous as her physical, and her tendency to introspection was rendered more keen by illness. She could almost have envied the less sensitive mortals she met at the *table d'hôte*, and a voice within her suggested that her sadness took its rise in the austerity of her life. At the end of August she went to Beaumesnil, which she had scarcely seen, and there began an apostleship of good works, whilst every day endeared her more and more to her father and mother. Beaumesnil is a town of five or six hundred inhabitants, a few leagues from Bernay. The Duc de Laval had established there the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul; Xavérine developed his work by the *Œuvre de la Sainte Enfance*, the Sodality of the Children of Mary for the village girls, and the zest with which she labored for the souls of all around her. But, "as for me," she wrote of this period to Philomena, "I am privileged to be weary everywhere and always without cause, or rather with millions of reasons for being happy, for there's nobody on earth who wouldn't envy me my lot *except those*

who have need of suffering and sacrificing themselves for God, for my life is as pleasant as that of an Angora cat or a pet dog."

Unknown to herself she explains her *malaise*. There are souls who are happy only when they are unhappy; the shadow of Calvary is over them, and a pleasant life seems to them a reproach when they look at Our Lord dying on the Cross. In the spring of 1861, at the demand of Count de Maistre, an Italian Jesuit, Padre Santini, arrived at Beaumesnil to preach the month of May. This religious was much interested in St. Teresa, whose works he was translating for Italy, as P. Bouix had done for France. Xavérine was attracted to the Italian Padre, perhaps because he *was* Italian, and he on his side immediately discerned the worth of her soul and formed his conjectures as to whither God was calling her. In a very short space of time Xavérine had transferred her allegiance; fidelity to distant Dom Bertinelli was a small thing compared to profiting by the grace which Providence had so manifestly cast in her way.

Whilst Marie de Maistre, who had married the Marchese Farsati, and Xavérine were "melted into tenderness," as Philomena expressed it, in listening to P. Santini's unctuous reading of an evening, the austere Francesca was gradually bidding farewell to earth. Xavérine, who had gone on a visit to Philomena, at Bergamo, returned to Beaumesnil in time to witness her sister's holy death, and to feel in the strength of her new light and resolutions some of the effects of Francesca's sacrifice. Offering up her sufferings for the Holy Father and the Church, Francesca expired on the 29th of July, 1861, in the odor of sanctity. Penance and detachment had been her distinguishing virtues. Shortly before the end, as her mother was rubbing her forehead with *eau de Cologne*, she said: "Use vinegar instead; it will be cheaper and better befitting a poor creature like I am." Two days later, on the feast of St. Ignatius, Xavérine began a retreat of thirty days' under Padre Santini's direction, to obtain further confirmation from the Holy Spirit on the subject of her religious vocation. The more she became immersed in the solitude of the exercises the greater became her certainty that God was calling her to give up all things for Him. "Francesca," she said, "has gained me the grace to leave home."

Xavérine had no sooner finished her thirty days in the desert than P. Santini prepared to leave Beaumesnil. He had done his work there, which seemed to be rather to show Xavérine the way to Carmel than to preach to its inhabitants. They never met again on earth, but the soul that loves God and has found its vocation, has little need of the creature's help.

How Xavérine, with her wretched health, was to confront the

austerities of a Carmelite's life was not the least supernatural part of her vocation, but her very delicacy furnished her with a means of leaving home and of bearing in her own courageous heart alone the bitterest pangs of the sacrifice. The doctor ordered her to winter at Nice. She petitioned to be allowed to stay there alone, meaning to break herself gently the while from all the ties of flesh and blood, and never to return to the shelter of her father's roof. It was settled that the Count and Countess de Maistre should accompany her to the South and leave her at the house of a relative, the Countess de Camburzano, after which she was to go for a time to the Visitation Convent. Her last days at Beaumesnil were passed in agony at the thought of what she was leaving, but she kept her secret to herself, and saved the feelings of her father and mother. The winter was well over before she saw her promised land. She had almost drained the cup of parting, tasting all its bitterness, drop by drop, during her six months at Nice; but Our Lord was mindful of her oblation, and he sent her always desolation where others would have found their joy. On the 15th of May, 1862, she entered the Carmel of Poitiers. On her way from Nice a priest had happened to find out the end of her journey, and had questioned her as to her motives. "What are you going there for?" he had asked. "To suffer," she had answered.

Worldly romances show us to the door of the nuptial chamber and there close. Why should we seek to penetrate further into the mysterious secrets of the Divine Bridegroom? A few months later, on August 21st, 1862, Sister Teresa of Jesus stood in her white marriage robes at the altar of sacrifice. Her father gave her away and she retired for ever behind the thick veils of Carmel, to suffer, labor, and pray for souls, to lay up gold in the treasury of the Church.

As her girlhood had been, so was her religious life, fuller of the Cross than of joy, knowing rather the thorns of her chosen One's crown than the roses of His tenderness. She was elected first subprioress, then prioress, and whilst she held this latter office she was called from earth at the early age of thirty-three.

Evil times are spreading over us the dark atmosphere of materialism. It is invigorating to inhale for a time the pure air of higher regions, and to know that even in our days God is loved with the entire worship of hearts and with the whole burnt offerings of human lives. Let Xavérine de Maistre and those who have the fortitude and the call to imitate her example trim the fire of penance which is to keep the charity of Christians from growing cold.

THE RAILROAD AND KINDRED MONOPOLIES.

UNTIL quite recently it was commonly believed that our democratic forms of government furnished an all-sufficient guarantee against the domination of any one class of persons, and the consequent depression and subjection of others. It was supposed, too, that no such extremes of riches and poverty as are found in European countries could come to exist here, through which a few persons inherit or acquire, and continue to accumulate, wealth, beyond all possibility of rationally enjoying it, while vast multitudes of other persons are, year by year, sinking down deeper into an abyss of hopeless destitution and misery.

Yet facts within the personal view of every observing person prove that this supposition is a sheer delusion. The conditions of decent, respectable subsistence are rapidly becoming more difficult; they have already become practically unattainable to vast multitudes; and their children have nothing better to look forward to.

Until a few years back, it was the boast of every Fourth of July orator, and of every demagogue who courted popularity, that in this country the variety of pursuits was so great, and the recompense of honest labor so generous, that nothing else but industry and reasonable economy was required to insure a decent livelihood and a competent provision against sickness and old age.

The man who would indulge in such euphemistic exaggeration now, would be set down as either an idiot or an audacious falsifier. In every direction the cry goes up from unemployed millions, "Give Us Work!" It is not *bread* that they demand, but *work*. And the distinction is well worth noting. It is not "a distinction without a difference," but one which carries with it a deep and pregnant meaning. It signifies that it is not alms which the vast multitude of unemployed working-men and working-women in our country demand, but *work*; they do not want to live at any one else's cost and expense, nor at the cost and expense of the entire public. They are willing to work; all that they ask is the opportunity to work. Yet of these men and women who are willing to do "a fair day's work for a fair day's wages," estimates made by different writers, estimates based on a comparison of the returns of the last United States census, with other more recent statistics gathered from reliable sources, concur in the statement that the number of unemployed persons among those who may be properly included under the phrase "working classes," as commonly understood, is about two millions.

Nor is this the darkest side of the picture which facts present. While two millions of persons are clamoring for an opportunity to earn, we will not say a livelihood, but even a bare subsistence by honest work; and while week by week and month by month thousands and tens of thousands of them, disheartened and discouraged, yield to the compulsion of stern necessity, and swell the rapidly increasing number of "tramps," who in summer become a public nuisance and a cause of fear and terror in every rural community, and in winter crowd, beyond their capacity to receive and provide for them, the "lock-ups" and temporary refuges and jails of our towns and cities; while this is the fact as regards multitudes of unemployed workingmen, the cry goes forth from other thousands and hundreds of thousands of workingmen, of workingwomen, of boys turned prematurely into men, and young girls made prematurely women, by having to face the stern realities of life and plunge into the intense strife for existence, and depend upon themselves while yet they ought to be under their father's and mother's protection and care,—the cry goes forth.

"We have work; we are working; working like slaves, working harder than slave owners made their slaves to work, but we are not fairly paid. Our condition is worse than that of slaves. They are sure of sufficient food by day to keep up their strength, and of a shelter by night; we are not. We work harder than they do, and our condition is worse. If our strength gives out, if sickness or old age overtakes us, our employers, or masters, cast us off with as little consideration and concern as they cast aside a worn-out piece of machinery, and with less of regret or commiseration than a crippled or superannuated mule. We are treated worse than slaves, worse, far worse, than brute beasts of labor. We are willing to work; but we do not receive a fair or just recompense for our work. We do not receive a fair, honest wage for a fair, honest day's work."

That these are facts, and that the words we have put into the mouths of the millions who compose our working classes are a truthful expression in plain English of their thoughts and feelings, every one who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with their condition, and their sentiments, will acknowledge.

And what a satire is not this state of things upon our vain proclamation: "Happy, Prosperous America!" What a commentary upon the pregnant clause of our Declaration of Independence, "That all men are endowed with certain *inalienable rights*," among which are "*Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness*."

What of *Life*, we ask (life in this world we mean, for to that the Declaration of Independence refers, and we do not propose in this paper going beyond the principles of natural reason and mere human ethics), can the millions enjoy, who toil in and about our

coal and iron-ore mines, our quarries and mills and factories, our stores and shops, and yet, who, when each month expires, find themselves without sufficient savings, unless they have stinted and starved themselves, to subsist without employment for one month ahead? What of *liberty* do those persons possess who are absolutely dependent from day to day upon the meagre wages their employer pays them, and who, if they would leave his employ, would have practically to starve for months before they could find work elsewhere?

What of substantial, practical opportunity, or possibility even, to engage in the "Pursuit of Happiness" do they possess who must toil from month to month, and year to year, without finding themselves a dollar in advance of their previous dependent precarious condition?

The truth is, that instead of our growth in population, and our progress in the settlement of our unpopulated territories, and the utilization of our forests, and of the treasures (gaseous, liquid, and solid) in and under the surface soil of our country, marking a corresponding increase of comfort and prosperity to the majority of the people of the United States, they seem, they *do*, indeed (according to the combined testimony of indisputable facts), keep even step with the depression and degradation of vast multitudes, if not of the majority, of the people of the United States.

For the majority of the people of our country, as of every other country on earth, is composed of those who must earn their daily bread by their daily toil; and the number of these is increasing with far greater rapidity than the increase of our population. In other words, the proportion of those who can live at their ease is diminishing, while the proportion of those who are slavishly dependent is increasing with fearful rapidity. In other words, in sardonic contradiction to our vain boast of political equality, and of its supposed consequent, the social respectability of every class and position in society, we have entered upon the road by which "the rich are becoming richer, and the poor poorer;" and we are advancing so rapidly along it that those who work for wages are confronted with the alternative of becoming mere "proletariats," dependent entirely upon the will of their employers for work and subsistence, or else are becoming "tramps" or public paupers.

We are well aware that the substantial truth of these statements is denied, and that they have been widely controverted in various ways. Statistical tables have been framed to show that wages are higher now than they were years ago; that money has a greater degree of purchasing power, and consequently that the condition of wage-workers has improved of late years.

Without diverging from our intended line of thought to refute

these statements, it is sufficient to say that facts everywhere around us prove that they are misleading and fallacious. The increasing misery and wretchedness; the increasing intensity of the struggle for employment; the increasing number of the unemployed in all our cities and towns; the misery that characterizes the condition of our mining regions; the supplanting there of American, Irish, Scotch, and Welsh miners with imported laborers, who are little else than barbarians, and live as no civilized human beings are willing or should be willing to live; these and other kindred facts utterly disprove the assertion that the material condition of the people of the United States, as a whole, is becoming more comfortable, more independent, or happier.

Some of our readers, perhaps, may regard these general remarks as irrelevant to the subject suggested by the title of our paper—"Railroad and Kindred Monopolies." They are not, however. For we directly charge, and it is the purpose of our article to prove, that monopolies are a productive cause of these and other evils; and that chief among these monopolies, and the most pernicious of them, is the railroad monopoly.

When railroads were first constructed in the United States, it was intended that they should serve and promote the same general public purposes which turnpikes, canals, and navigable lakes and rivers promoted, and in a much more efficient way. It was intended that they should be public highways, over which the travel and traffic of our country should pass with like facilities, and freedom of individual action and enterprise, which turnpikes, canals, and navigable lakes and rivers had afforded.

For this reason extensive privileges and powers were granted to them; privileges and powers which are never granted to individuals in their private personal capacity, and which would not have been granted to railroad corporations, or any other corporations, except with the expectation and intention that their powers should be employed strictly and impartially for the promotion of the public interests. The right to charge reasonable rates for the services they performed was conceded in order that the stockholders might receive a fair and equitable return for the capital they invested.

Thus public interests, and not individual or corporate emolument, were the chief and primary purpose of creating these corporations and allowing them to exist. It was never intended that they should control and dominate public interests and become practically independent of the civil authority to which they owe their existence. It was supposed that the limitations of their charters and the established principles of the Common and Statutory Law would be a sufficient safeguard against any such abuse of the powers granted to them.

Contrary, however, to all such expectations, these corporations, have become virtual monopolies. Instead of promoting freedom of individual enterprise and action in business, they render it virtually impossible in many of our most important industries. Instead of the public interests being the shaping and moulding purpose of their management, they are managed and controlled entirely in the interests of a few plutocrats, with a view to increasing their overgrown and often ill-gotten wealth, and to this purpose even the interests of the stockholders as well as of the public generally are entirely subordinated. Instead of respecting the provisions and limitations of their charters, the organic law of their being, to which they owe their very existence, they evade them or contemptuously and defiantly disregard and overleap them. They corrupt our legislatures, pollute the fountains of public justice at their very sources, and entrench themselves in the Supreme Courts of the several States, and the Senate of the United States.

These are grave charges, but they are easily proved. To cite all the evidence that might be adduced would be an endless task. It is one, however, which it is needless to enter upon. For, while many of the proofs of what we have said are so hidden and systematically covered over by the tortuous means these corporations resort to in order to increase the difficulties of adducing legal evidence of their malversations and constant violations of law, yet the facts themselves are so notorious and so undeniable that a mere statement of them, or even a bare reference to them, is sufficient to induce conviction.

Accordingly, we pass on to point out the manner and processes by which these railroad monopolies have acquired the enormous powers they exercise, and through the active exercise of which they have not only become monopolies themselves, but have created or fostered other monopolies closely allied to them, and through which they control all the greater and more important industries of our country.¹

¹ One of the plainest and most obvious instances of this is the close combination that has been formed between railroads and all great coal-mining companies; or rather the absorption (in some instances by the railroad companies as corporations, and in other instances by their chief officials) of the greater part of the coal-producing territory of our country. It was never intended that railroad companies should engage either directly or indirectly in the business of mining coal or producing coke. You search their charters in vain for any provision authorizing or empowering them to do this. But what these companies have no right or authority according to law to do, it is notorious they do by in some instances evading the law, and in other instances openly defying it. The entire coal (both anthracite and bituminous) and coke-producing business of Pennsylvania amounts annually, at market prices, to more than two hundred millions of dollars. Yet this immense business, with which railroad corporations have no more necessary connection than they have with the weaving of cloth

I. The first step in this process that we mention, not perhaps first in the order of time, but first as giving practical power to work out their evil results, is that of "stock watering," or in other words, unnecessarily increasing the capital stock of a corporation. It is mainly through this means that the large stockholders and directors and chief officials of railroads have been enabled to acquire enormous wealth, while, according to the official reports of those companies, the stockholders were only receiving reasonable returns on their actual investments.

In this way the public are effectively hoodwinked and deluded. Corporations which started with a few hundred thousands of dollars of actual capital have reaped such enormous profits that they have divided forty, fifty, sixty and in some instances more than one hundred per cent. upon the actual investment. But this fact was concealed from the public by increasing the nominal stock capital to such amounts that the dividends declared seemed to be only six, eight, or ten per cent.

Other and more reprehensible purposes are subserved by this process of watering stock. They are made the means by which a few individuals may enrich themselves at the expense of the general stockholders of a company or of the whole community. A corporation whose original capital stock was, say, ten millions of dollars, may have its stock basis thus expanded or "watered" until it reaches fifty or one hundred millions. And at each stage of the process it may be so managed that a large part of these additions enure to the benefit of a few individuals.

It is not necessary to point out in detail the various expedients and means employed to make these stock-watering schemes suc-

or the making of shoes, is entirely controlled (with a few trifling exceptions) by ten or twelve railroad companies or monopolies sustained by them.

Nor is even this the worst of this matter. Five or six individuals as regards the anthracite coal trade, and about the same number as regards the bituminous coal and coke trade, chatting together in one of their offices, or dining and wining in a private parlor at some fashionable resort, exercise more than dictatorial powers over the aggregate quantity of coal and coke that shall be produced from year to year, the quantities that each region shall furnish, the amounts that each railroad shall receive and transport, and the prices at which it shall be sold in different markets. In this way they crush out all individual operators except those whom they choose to favor, and virtually levy a tax upon the aggregate coal and coke production of Pennsylvania of at least fifty millions of dollars; and of this tax the residents and manufacturers of Philadelphia and adjacent districts must pay not less than ten millions of dollars.

In like manner the transportation and refining of petroleum has been concentrated through the active assistance and agency of a few railroads into the hands of a monopoly—known as the "Standard Oil Company." It was organized about fifteen years ago under a charter from the State of Ohio, and from about \$300,000 at the start, its resources have grown to the enormous sum of upwards of \$100,000,000, while the profits it has meanwhile divided to its favored stockholders, at the expense of the oil producers, and of the citizens of Pennsylvania, have probably far exceeded that amount.

cessful. Our public newspapers are constantly exposing them. But almost always after the wrong has been done. It is well known, however, that the principal part of the immense wealth of the larger number of our railroad magnates has been acquired in this way, while at the same time stock has been foisted upon the public to the amount of thousands of millions of dollars.

In some few instances the earnings of the railroad companies whose capitalization is thus manipulated have been able to pay dividends on their increased stock, but in many instances they have not been able to do it. And it is a significant fact that when the stock had depreciated or become utterly worthless, very little of it remained in the hands of the directors and high officials of those roads. They had worked it off upon the public, and the public has had to bear the loss.

The New York, West Shore & Buffalo Railroad is an instance in point. It was capitalised at an aggregate of \$119,000,000 of stock and bonds. The projectors made a contract with a construction company composed of themselves. According to the terms of this contract they were to receive \$200,000 for each mile of double track and \$100,000 for each mile of single track, in stock and bonds. They did not succeed, owing to the state of the money market and the powerful opposition of the Vanderbilts and their allies, in working off as much of these stocks and bonds as their scheme contemplated, nor at as favorable rates. But they did succeed in deluding the outside public into taking a sufficient quantity to enable them to construct the road without expending a dollar of their own money. Hundreds of deluded purchasers of their stock and bonds incurred severe losses. The projectors lost nothing. The proportion of honest capital to that of fictitious may be inferred from the fact that the actual cost of the work done in constructing the road was \$34,160,000. The amount of bonds and stock issued was \$119,000,000.

The uncompleted South Penna. Railroad is another instance. It is a road which has long been greatly needed by the entire southern tier of counties in Pennsylvania, west of Harrisburg. It would have been built thirty years ago but for the persistent and overpowering opposition of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. Its construction would have given the whole region of country mentioned a direct communication with Harrisburg and thence with Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore and Washington, whereas now their communication is indirect, circuitous, dilatory and at exorbitant rates over various branches of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Its construction would have developed natural resources of immense aggregate value, of "the soil, the forest and the mine;" would have increased the population of those counties and added

greatly to the valuation of their taxable property and thus increase the State revenue.

A late phase in the railroad war furnished an opportunity to construct the road in defiance of the opposition of the Pennsylvania Railroad, by enlisting Vanderbilt in the project. He was approached and consented to invest several million dollars in the project. The remainder of the amount required was subscribed by a small number of wealthy capitalists. But then another element was introduced.

The original projectors had an offer from reliable and experienced parties to build and equip the road for \$10,000,000. On that cost it would have been able to carry freight and passengers from Pittsburgh to Harrisburg and intermediate points, and thence to Philadelphia, New York and Baltimore, at lower rates than the Pennsylvania Railroad, and yet earn much larger dividends. But the projectors were not satisfied with that. Their scheme was to issue bonds enough to build and equip the road, without encroaching at all on the stock capital, which then would represent their profits. In other words, they would make the general public pay the whole cost of building and equipping the road, while they would reap large dividends from stock which cost them nothing.

But even this did not satisfy Mr. Vanderbilt. Like poor Oliver Twist, he "wanted more." Accordingly, the stocks and bonds of the road which could be built for \$10,000,000, were placed at \$40,000,000, that is, \$20,000,000 of stock and an equal amount of bonds. Then, still further, in order to satisfy Mr. Vanderbilt, work, which responsible contractors agreed to do for \$6,500,000, was awarded to a construction company, said to consist of his son-in-law, his clerks and brokers, for \$15,000,000.

Yet even on this fictitious basis—making the public pay four dollars for one that the projectors advanced, and giving Vanderbilt a profit of eight and a half millions of dollars after repaying a temporary expenditure of six and a half millions, the construction of the road would have been beneficial to Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. It would have enhanced the value of property in Southern Pennsylvania a hundred millions of dollars, would have converted into productive farms and prosperous villages and towns districts of country which are now sparsely settled or virtual wastes, and, at the same time, would have earned larger dividends, and at lower rates for transportation, than could the Pennsylvania Railroad, with its enormously expanded capitalization and its many unprofitable extensions.

The construction of the road, however, has been discontinued through illegal action of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the betrayal by Vanderbilt of other capitalists who had put their money

into the road in good faith. The formal consummation of the "deal" was prevented by the action of the Attorney-General of Pennsylvania. But each of the two real parties to it have reaped all the substantial advantages they bargained for. Vanderbilt has gotten the New York, West Shore and Buffalo Railroad, and the Pennsylvania Railroad has entirely stopped, for the time being, the construction of the South Pennsylvania Railroad.

But the instances we have mentioned, of creating fictitious securities and stock, that is, bonds and stock which do not represent actually invested capital, are trivial compared with other instances. Of \$146,000,000, representing the stock and bonds of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, nearly one-half, according to the report of a New York legislative investigating committee, is "water." Of \$160,000,000 capitalization of the New York and Erie Railroad the proportion of fictitious securities and stock is still larger. Of \$259,000,000 stock and bonds issued by the Central Pacific and Union Pacific Railways, it is credibly estimated that less than one-third represents real, invested capital. The Pennsylvania Railroad was capitalized, in 1884, at \$156,000,000, yet the actual cost of construction and equipment was but \$75,000,000. Taking the entire railroad system of the United States, the aggregate of fictitious capitalization, according to Poor's *Railway Manual*, amounted to the enormous sum of three thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven millions of dollars.

A gigantic wrong is thus inflicted upon the public, upon *bonâ fide* individual investors in railway securities, and upon the railway system itself. The practice is demoralizing in the highest degree. It leads railway directors and officers, and the bankers through whom they conduct their financial transactions, to make delusive and misleading statements, and to resort to other culpable expedients to deceive the public, which, when practised on a smaller scale by other persons, would justly cause them to be regarded as common cheats and swindlers.

The newspaper press, too, is brought under these same demoralizing influences. Directly or indirectly, it is subsidized to conceal or varnish over and palliate, or boldly to defend the falsifications, the deceptions and corrupt practices of railroad magnates and their chief officials. They are lauded for their foresight and energy, their skill and enterprise, their sterling integrity, their zeal to promote public interests; they are held up to admiration as public benefactors and model citizens, when it is an open secret that their hands are polluted with bribes, and that they have used the immense influence and power connected with their official positions and their official intimate knowledge of the actual condition and present and future policy of the railways whose management

is entrusted to them, for their own personal emolument and the enriching of their favorites. By these means men who were poor and without financial credit, and whose official salaries were insufficient to make them quickly wealthy, have been enabled, in a few years, to become millionaires.

Not many years ago a President of one of the great railways of Pennsylvania died, distinguished alike for his engineering ability, his haughty reticence, and his autocratical dictatorship. The columns of the daily newspapers were crowded with sickening laudations of his pure and spotless integrity.

Yet, it was notorious that he had given the aid of his name and influence to numerous corporations, and had consented to be placed on their boards of direction in return for gifts of stocks and bonds, in which he had not invested even a dollar.

In connection with his chief lieutenant, and subsequent successor in office, he so loaded down the railroad company of which he was president and virtual dictator, with investments in unprofitable railways that he brought it to the verge of bankruptcy; and an "investigating" committee, which might truthfully be also styled a "whitewashing" committee, was constrained to recommend the relinquishment of all control over a number of these railroads, the sale of their depreciated securities, and the charging to the "Profit and Loss" account of others of them which were utterly worthless. The aggregate loss amounted to tens of millions of dollars.

To what extent these financial blunders were owing to honest misjudgment on his part, despite the extraordinary financial foresight and prudence universally attributed to him, and to what extent they were owing to his being influenced by proffers and gifts enuring to his own personal advantage, it is impossible to know. For, searching investigation into the facts was repeatedly and persistently refused by those who controlled the action of the very stockholders whose interests were thus imperilled and seriously injured.

As one instance of this, a property, represented to be valuable for the coal it was *supposed* to contain, was bargained for by one of the then directors of this railroad for a few thousand dollars and sold at an immense advance to the railway company or one of the mining corporations it had created and controlled—the sale being ostensibly made by the original owner of the land, and the director's interest and profit in the transaction being carefully concealed. After persistent refusal to investigate the fraudulent transaction, the substantial facts were brought to light. Public indignation was aroused, and the director who initiated the "deal" was overwhelmed with denunciations by the newspaper press. In self-exculpation he published an open letter, in which he declared that the

profits of the transaction had been divided with other directors or influential officials of the railway company, who were cognizant of the transaction, and among whom was the President himself; and that, in his attempts to prevent exposure, he had had to part with more than his individual share of the profits and was actually a loser in the end.

Yet the public press systematically refrained from noticing the connection of this "model" railway President, this "pure" and "spotless" and "honored" citizen with the fraudulent transaction.

Surely it is needless to point out the pernicious, demoralizing influence of this upon public opinion and the glaring inconsistency of thus condoning and concealing, or representing even as positive virtues, the corrupt practices of great railroad magnates, while the comparatively petty offences of common scoundrels and swindlers are unsparingly denounced.

But these remarks are divergent from our immediate subject—the watering of railroad securities—though not from our general subject. But to return to our present topic, the fictitious element in our railway policy. The evil is not confined to its being used by railroad magnates as means to build up enormous fortunes for themselves and their favorites, at the expense of the public and of the general holders of railway stock. It extends much further. It imposes an unnecessary tax and one of enormous aggregate amount upon the whole business done over railways which the public must pay in the shape of higher charges for freight and passenger transportation. For, according to Poor's Railway Manual, the amounts of actual and fictitious capital in the railways of the United States are almost exactly equal—each of them amounting in 1883 to upwards of \$3,700,000,000, and probably now approximating \$4,000,000,000.

This enormous amount of fictitious capital having been created and worked off upon the public, it becomes necessary, in order to sustain their credit and the market value of their securities, for the railroads to make corresponding efforts to increase their revenues. To maintain public confidence they must pay annually or semi-annually dividends or interest on twice the amount of their actual capital, that is, on \$4,000,000,000 of actual capital and also on an equal amount of fictitious capital.

The enormous tax thus needlessly imposed on the public may be seen from a few simple figures. Taking the actual investment in railways throughout the United States at \$4,000,000,000 and the fictitious capital as equal in amount (and these figures are approximately accurate), it is necessary that the net earnings of our railways (after meeting all expenses) in order to pay 5 per cent. on both

their actual and their fictitious capital should amount to four hundred millions of dollars. Yet without the fictitious element one-half of that amount of net earnings would be sufficient.

Thus the traffic over our railways has to pay, in the shape of higher rates than would otherwise be necessary, an annual tax of two hundred millions of dollars because of the fictitious stock and bonds that have been foisted on the public by our railway corporations.

And to bring the bearing of this branch of our subject more closely home to the citizens of Pennsylvania: Investigation has proved that the aggregate amount of fictitious capital of the five great anthracite coal railroad and mining corporations is at least two hundred and fifty millions of dollars, while the actual invested capital does not exceed, if it equals, this sum. Thus the anthracite coal business of Pennsylvania is burdened with an unnecessary annual tax, which at 5 per cent. per annum amounts to twelve and a half millions of dollars.

Who pay this needless tax it is unnecessary to investigate. A part, and a large part in the aggregate of it, is imposed on the miners and laborers in and about our anthracite coal mines, in the form of wages systematically kept down to the lowest possible rate. Another large part is paid by every family in Pennsylvania that uses anthracite coal and by every manufacturer who employs it in his furnaces, mills and factories.

The remaining and smaller part of this enormous tax is paid by the consumers of anthracite coal in other States. For, owing to the cut-throat policy adopted by these competing and yet illegally conspiring and combining incorporated anthracite coal monopolies, towns and cities in Pennsylvania in close proximity to the anthracite coal mines (distant not more than sixty miles, and from that to one hundred miles) are compelled to pay higher than in the cities of Baltimore, and New York, and the manufacturing towns of Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts.

We need not pause, or diverge from our line of thought, to point out the bearing of this upon the industrial interests of Pennsylvania. For it is obvious that it practically places all of them at a disadvantage; and that it practically subsidizes and promotes those of New York and of the New England States.

Suffice it to say, and with this remark we dismiss the subject of fictitious capitalization of anthracite coal monopolies, that the *public* (however and upon whomsoever the tax be imposed) have to pay an unnecessary annual tax of twelve and a half millions of dollars, or else suffer the loss which would be involved in a depreciation of five hundred millions of dollars of stocks and bonds which they have been induced by delusive representations to purchase.

For it is not the railroad magnates nor their chief officials and special friends who lose when their inflated stocks and bonds depreciate. They are in position to see the coming crash and get out of its way before it comes and before the public can get any knowledge of it. Indeed, instead of suffering by the fall in the market price of the stocks and bonds which they themselves have issued, they commonly make another profit out of it. For unscrupulous greed can not only impose fictitious securities upon the public, but it can make enormous profits by artificially causing vast fluctuations in prices, to the injury and sometimes the ruin of innocent parties and the hurt and demoralization of the financial world.

It is this fictitious element that is the chief cause of the frequent convulsions in the stock markets of our great cities and of the general distrust of nearly all railroad "securities." When the business of the country is prosperous and its volume large, railroads can get sufficient traffic at remunerative rates to pay the interest on their indebtedness and declare sufficient dividends upon their stock to keep them at or above par. But when business becomes temporarily depressed, necessitating a reduction of railway charges, fierce conflicts ensue between the different railway lines over the amounts of traffic they shall respectively carry and the rates they shall charge.

Were the capitalization honestly confined to the amounts of money actually invested in the railways, there would be no incentive or occasion for these "cut-throat" contests and railroad wars. For even in its periods of temporary depression the business of the country is sufficient to enable all our great railways to earn fair and reasonable profits on their actual investments; but not on their fictitious capitalization.

The Pennsylvania Railroad, for example, in 1884, earned \$12,621,000, or apparently about 8 per cent. upon its capital stock, amounting to one hundred and fifty-six millions of dollars. But of this stock only seventy-five millions of dollars represented the actual cost of constructing and equipping the roads that made these earnings, and the other eighty-one millions represented investments in other roads. The net earnings therefore were about 17 per cent. on the actual investment in the roads that produced those earnings.

So, too, the net earnings of all the railways in the United States in 1883 were equal to about $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. upon the total amount of their stocks, bonds, and other indebtedness. But excluding the fictitious element and reducing the capitalization to the actual honest investment at that time (three thousand seven hundred and eighty-seven millions of dollars according to *Poor's Manual*) the net earnings for the year equalled about 9 per cent.

Various remedies have been proposed to prevent fictitious capitalization and its concomitant evils. Some of them are highly

objectionable, as they would prevent freedom of action in constructing new railroads or extending those already in existence. There is a remedy, simple and effective, were it faithfully employed. It is to make it a *criminal* offence for the directors to authorize and allow, and the presidents, vice-presidents, secretaries, and treasurers to sign and issue any stocks, bonds, or other certificates of indebtedness, except for each dollar actually invested. General railroad laws and rigid charter limitations seem good enough on paper, but they are constantly evaded or defied. And this will continue so long as the directors and chief officials of railways are not made personally amenable by fine and imprisonment for their disregard of constitutional and legal prohibitions.

II. Another crying abuse of power by our railway and other mammoth corporations, is their systematic discrimination in favor of certain individuals and certain localities and against others. In this way a few favored individuals are enabled to monopolize certain lines of business to the loss and frequently the ruin of hundreds of others. As showing the extent to which this discrimination is carried, we mention that, in the course of an investigation ordered by the Legislature of New York, it was proved that five firms at Binghamton and the same number at Elmira, obtained special rates from the Erie Railway, varying from five-eighths to one-third of the general tariff rate. On the New York Central Railway it was proved that special rates of 9 cents were given to three dry-goods firms in Utica against 33, 26, and 22 cents charged to other merchants in that city engaged in the same business. The same rate of 9 cents was granted to five grocery firms in Syracuse, while the other grocers were charged 37, 29, 25, and 18 cents on the same character of freight. Four Rochester grocery firms got 13 cents, while all others had to pay tariff rates of 40, 30, 25, and 20 cents. Special rates were thus made to a few favored individuals at twenty-two points between Albany and Buffalo. The special rates at some of the points were but little more than one-third the regular rates; and at one point it was only one-fifth. On cotton cloths the special rate to one manufacturer was 20 cents, while the schedule rate was 35 and 40 cents.

As regards the element of distance the same unfair discriminations were proved. The rate to Little Falls, 217 miles from New York, was 20 cents, which was exactly the same as that to Black Rock, 455 miles; while the rate to Syracuse, 291 miles, was 10 cents.

Like investigations have been attempted in Pennsylvania. But the overpowering influence exercised by the Pennsylvania Railroad over the Legislature and municipal and other corporations throughout the whole State (aided in this matter by the combined influ-

ence of other important railways) has always prevented searching and thorough investigation. Yet, still, sufficient facts have been brought to light, from time to time, to prove that favoritism towards certain individuals and against others, and towards certain localities and against others, is constantly practised.

Through this system vast fortunes have been accumulated in the course of a few years by certain individuals or firms, while hundreds of others have been driven out of business. The vast coke producing business of western Pennsylvania has been made as close or even a closer monopoly than the production of anthracite coal—the control of the entire coke-trade having become concentrated, through this favoritism, into the hands of five or six individuals or firms. As regards coal used for making gas: By a system of favoritism practised by the Pennsylvania Railroad two corporations (whose chief stockholders are officials of that company or their especial friends) have had for years a complete monopoly of supplying, and at exorbitant prices, the Philadelphia Gas Works. And through secret rebates granted to these two companies they have had great advantages over all other shippers and miners of the same kind of coal in all our seaboard markets, from the Delaware Bay and River as far north as Boston. The extent to which discrimination has been carried may be inferred from the fact that the charge for carrying a ton of coal from the Pittsburgh vein, if it be used for *steam*-producing purposes, is \$2.40; but, if used for *gas*-production, the rate is, or was, twice as much.

It is a fact that all efforts to investigate and expose the corruption and abuses of the Philadelphia Gas-Trust have been rendered futile by the persistent refusal of the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, and the minor corporations already referred to, to give any information to the investigating committee on points which involved the favoritism they practised. Thus these companies have aided and abetted the concealment of corrupt and criminal practices by members of the Gas-Trust, if they were not (as there seems to be good reason to believe they were) direct participants in their fraudulent transactions.

Another instance is that of an extensive owner of coal property along the line of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. He made a large contract to furnish coal to New York gas-works. On asking for specific rates of transportation, he was told that by an agreement with the Pennsylvania Railroad no coal could be shipped from the region of his mines, for gas-producing purposes, to any point between Delaware Bay and Cape Cod; and a prohibitory rate was established against him. He was compelled to fill his contract by purchasing coal, at a loss of about \$1 per ton, from

mines in western Pennsylvania, and was forced into bankruptcy. His mines were purchased by a prominent director in a third railroad, and this director found no difficulty in getting satisfactory rates.

We pass on to another instance of discrimination and its effects. It is notable alike for the vast scale upon which it was and still is carried on, its success in building up a huge monopoly and its ruinous effects upon an important Pennsylvania industry. We refer to the Standard Oil Company. The production of petroleum is confined almost exclusively to Pennsylvania, the quantities produced by other States forming but a small fraction of the aggregate amount. Yet, through the action of this monopoly, fostered and built up by the direct, but secret, action of four railroad monopolies, prominent among which is the so-called "*Pennsylvania*" Railroad, the State of Pennsylvania and its citizens have been robbed of tens, yes, of hundreds of millions of dollars, that rightfully should have accrued to them by reason of the stores of petroleum beneath the surface of Pennsylvania oil-producing regions.

Some fifteen years ago, under a charter from the State of Ohio, the Standard Oil Company was incorporated with a capital of \$300,000. Whether or not John D. Rockefeller was its first originator, he quickly became its ruling spirit and master. Its chief idea was to so bind the great trunk line railways to it that it could crush out all rivals and monopolize the entire business, both of shipping the crude petroleum and refining it. No evidence attainable by the public exists, by which a full knowledge has been obtained of the methods it employed to carry this scheme into practical effect. Suffice it to say that it succeeded to such an extent that the value of the Standard Oil Company's wealth has increased, in the period of fifteen years, from three hundred thousand dollars to one hundred millions of dollars, and it is currently believed that the dividends it has periodically declared upon its stock have equalled, if not exceeded, the last-named sum. Who and how many railroad officials have been made personally "interested" in promoting this monopoly, is a secret buried in their breasts and in the breasts of a few of the chiefs of this mammoth monopoly. Every attempt at investigation has been successfully evaded or defiantly resisted.

Yet despite all this, enough has come to public knowledge to prove the following facts:

1. That in favor of the Standard Oil Company's refineries at Cleveland, Ohio, and against Pittsburgh refineries, the advantage of 250 miles less of distance (the difference being as 425 miles against 675 miles) of the aggregate transportation of crude oil from the wells to Pittsburgh and Cleveland and of refined oil thence to

seaboard markets was ignored; and the same price, without regard to distance, was charged by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

2. In addition to this publicly declared arbitrary arrangement of rates, by virtue of a secret compact with the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, the New York Central, and the Erie Railroads, the Standard Oil Company was able to sell refined oil in the Eastern markets at less than the first cost at other refineries, with the open rate added.

3. As far back as 1875, a concession was made to the Standard Oil Company of a net rate as low as the lowest net rate to all other companies, with a secret rebate of ten per cent. to that company on *all shipments of oil*, whether by *itself or by other companies*. Thus, the Standard Oil Company obtained from its allied railroad monopolies a rebate, not only on its own shipments, but also on those of all shipments made by other parties from the oil wells and refineries.

4. These rebates were subsequently increased to the extent of twenty per cent. and more. The exorbitant charges to other parties than the Standard Oil Company may be inferred from the fact that a number of oil-refining companies in Pittsburgh, who for a time refused to succumb to the monopoly, transported their oil to seaboard markets by shipping it 350 miles down the Ohio River to Huntingdon, and thence over the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad to Richmond, and thence by a largely increased distance over all direct routes to the Atlantic seaboard markets. But the contest was too unequal, and the independent companies and firms were compelled to sell out their plants to the Standard monopoly on its own terms, or else retire from business.

5. The extent to which the Standard Oil monopoly was thus favored, to the disadvantage of all other oil-purchasing, oil-refining and oil-transporting firms and companies, may be inferred from the testimony reluctantly given by one of the officials of the Pennsylvania Railroad, that the aggregate amounts of rebates conceded to the Standard Oil monopoly amounted, in the space of *sixteen months*, to *ten millions* of dollars.

6. The result of this combined dictation and favoritism has been that 95 per cent. of the business of transporting and refining the petroleum product of Pennsylvania is monopolized by the Standard Oil Company; numerous individuals and firms, in Pittsburgh, in the oil regions, in Baltimore and Philadelphia, engaged in the shipping or refining of oil, have been driven out of the business with a loss of millions of dollars, and the greater part of this remunerative traffic has been transferred to the vicinity of New York city.

7. Nor is even this the worst effect of this infamous monopoly,

fostered and strengthened by the direct or indirect influence of three or four of our chief railroad monopolies. By its power to dictate prices to Pennsylvania oil producers it reduced their profits to the lowest possible point; it compelled them to store their oil in its own tanks, or to send it to market, according to its own sovereign will; and to sell it or withhold it from sale as it ordered, and at the rates that it prescribed. It acquired the ownership or control of all the refineries in our great cities, and it so restricted and raised the prices of shipments of oil to European countries that it forced into precocious development and abnormal activity and successful competition with the Pennsylvania oil wells the oil-producing regions of southeastern Europe and western Asia.

We have reached the limits of our space, though not the limits of our intended comments, and must necessarily be brief in our further remarks.

The same unjustifiable discrimination is exercised by our great railroad monopolies in favor of certain localities and against others. As regards the State of Pennsylvania (not to go beyond it for instances and illustrations) the general effect of these discriminations may be inferred from the fact that frequently a tub of butter may be brought at less cost from Illinois to Philadelphia or New York than from central Pennsylvania. Swine and cows and bullocks and wheat and flour are carried to our seaboard cities from Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana, Illinois, and even trans-Mississippi States, at rates that are virtually prohibitory to Pennsylvania farmers and graziers and butter and cheese manufacturers. The same is the case with the lumber and the bark of Pennsylvania. A car-load of scantling, boards or shingles will be carried from northern Michigan over the lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad at rates which prevent like products of the forests of Pennsylvania reaching a market. Tanners in other States can obtain their hides from our seaports and send their leather to them at rates which virtually freeze out the tanning industry in Pennsylvania, though a vast supply of the bark employed in tanning is close at hand.

The share of the grain-trade which legitimately belongs to Philadelphia has been transferred to New York through the action of the Pennsylvania Railroad monopoly.

The natural advantages of Pittsburgh as an iron-producing and iron-manufacturing centre, by the same system of favoritism have been ignored; and that business is depressed in Pittsburgh in favor of furnaces at Cleveland, Ohio, and in the Mahoning and Shenango Valleys. The depression in the iron business of Pittsburgh from 1874 to 1878 was mainly due to arbitrary discrimination against it, and chiefly by the Pennsylvania Railroad. Thus the rates on iron ore at the beginning of that period ranged from \$2.95 to \$2.10 if

delivered at Pittsburgh, while they were only from \$1.25 to \$1.00 when delivered at Youngstown. The rates on pig iron shipped from the Shenango and Mahoning Valleys to Pittsburgh or to Cleveland, about an equal distance, showed a constant discrimination in favor of Cleveland of about 56 cents. The total freight charges on a ton of pig iron made at Pittsburgh were \$1.90 per ton greater than if made in the Mahoning Valley, for an equal mileage and amount of handling. On a ton of manufactured iron from the mills the discrimination against Pittsburgh was \$2.23. The total freight charges on a ton of bar iron shipped from Pittsburgh to Chicago, and from the Mahoning Valley to the same point, were respectively \$11.10 from Pittsburgh and \$7.57 from the Mahoning Valley, if by all-rail routes, though the difference in distance is trifling. If shipped by the lake and rail route the discrimination was 50 cents per ton greater.

The glass factories of New Jersey have delivered their products in Chicago and other points on the lakes and the Mississippi River at less cost for transportation than can those of Western Pennsylvania, owing to discrimination by the Pennsylvania Railroad against the industries of the very State which gave it being. Grain and flour have been hauled from Chicago to New York over the lines of the Pennsylvania Railroad at less rates than that road charged for its delivery in Pittsburgh, though the latter is only about half the distance for which the smaller rate was charged. Pennsylvania merchants and manufacturers, in order that they might send their wares to points west of Pennsylvania (in some instances as far as Denver), have shipped them to New York and thence back again past their own warehouses and mills at lower rates than they obtain, owing to this outrageous discrimination, if sent direct from the original points of shipment, though the needless increased haul back and forth through Pennsylvania and New Jersey amounted in various instances to two hundred, five hundred, nine hundred miles.

The effect of this policy of discrimination upon the interests and prosperity of Pennsylvania may be inferred from two facts which we state before bringing our remarks to a close.

In the decade between 1870 and 1880, according to the United States census returns, the aggregate increase in the valuation of farming lands was a thousand millions of dollars, or about ten per cent. Yet, during the same period, owing to discrimination against Pennsylvania products, there was a depreciation in the value of farm-lands in Pennsylvania of sixty-eight millions of dollars, notwithstanding there was an increase in the extent of cultivated land of nineteen hundred thousand acres. And these figures are confirmed by statistical statements recently published in the Philadelphia

Record showing that the value per acre of agricultural products in Pennsylvania has decreased.

There is but one intelligible explanation of this. It is that the products of the farms as well as of the forests and the mines of Pennsylvania are systematically hindered in their natural increase by discriminations against them. The farmers and cattle producers of Pennsylvania are prevented from sending with profit, to markets beyond the State, what they have to sell, by virtually prohibitory rates of transportation. Then, too, their home-markets are stunted in growth by the discriminations made against Pennsylvania manufacturers. The manufacturers north and east and west of Pennsylvania are favored by railroad discriminations in the prices at which they obtain their coal and other raw materials, and favored again by discrimination in the rates of delivering their manufactured products. Then, to crown the injustice and outrage, even the home markets of Pennsylvania are in great degree supplied, through discrimination in favor of the Western States and against the people of Pennsylvania, as regards almost every article of consumption. Grain, flour, feed, butter, cheese, swine, cattle, horses, lumber, and almost everything the farm or forest can produce, are delivered at lower rates from far distant points than Pennsylvania land-owners can have them transported for. Is it any wonder that Pennsylvania is not prospering to the extent that might reasonably be expected from its natural advantages? Any wonder that population increases slowly and business of every kind, whether agricultural, manufacturing or mercantile, moves sluggishly?

The second fact we state, and it is the last we shall cite, confirms the one we have just commented on. Ever since the Pennsylvania Railroad (in order to monopolize the railroad business between Philadelphia and New York) acquired virtual ownership of the United Railroads of New Jersey, and so, too, ever since it acquired (for a like purpose) its systems of railroads west of Pittsburgh and Erie (extending to Cleveland, Northern Michigan, Chicago, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis and other points), it has lost, if its official reports are true, from one to three million dollars annually, sometimes on each and sometimes on both of its railroad systems, east and west of Pennsylvania. And year by year the Pennsylvania Railroad officials congratulate the stockholders, assuring them that, though their railroads through New Jersey and their railroads west of Pittsburgh and Erie have been operated at a loss, yet the profits on local freights to and from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia and intervening points not only have made up these losses, but have earned sufficient profits over and above them to pay fixed charges and justify a dividend.

Now, what does this mean? It means simply this, that by exorbi-

tant charges upon the business of the people of Pennsylvania, who are almost entirely shut out from the use of other railroads, the Pennsylvania Railroad gives *premiums* to the people of other States and carries their products at unremunerative rates, and then imposes the loss upon the people of Pennsylvania; thus actually making them to pay, in the shape of needless and oppressive charges, for the discriminations which the very railroad they gave corporate existence to and generously sustained through all the difficulties of its earlier existence, exercises in favor of other States and against Pennsylvania.

The aggregate amount which the people of Pennsylvania have thus paid up to the present time (as any one can verify—if he can get the successive annual reports of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company for the last twenty years) is not less (and probably much more) than from thirty to forty millions of dollars.

Pennsylvania is equal in geographical extent to the State of New York. It has a more genial climate, and a vastly greater quantity of land capable of being made productive. It is the first State in the Union as regards its quantities of coal and iron-ore. It has a monopoly of anthracite coal, and a virtual monopoly of petroleum and of supplies of natural gas. It is nearer to the southern seaboard States, both by water and by rail, than New York. It is nearer to the great West and Southwest. It is no farther from the vast Northwest. Its people are unexcelled for persistent energy and industry and thrift. Its chief city has direct water communication with every country whose shores abut upon the oceans of the world. Its second city is at the head of a system of river navigation that extends from St. Paul on the north to the Gulf of Mexico on the south, and westward to the Rocky Mountains. No other State has greater or equal natural advantages. We believe that if these advantages were properly and energetically utilized, Pennsylvania would be in population the first State in the Union. Yet Pennsylvania is not growing either in population or in wealth, or as regards its industrial activities, either agricultural or manufacturing or commercial, as rapidly as it might and should. And why? We can find no other answer than that Pennsylvania has given itself over to the control of monopolies, chiefly of railroad monopolies, and chief among them has been and continues to be the Pennsylvania Railroad. They are repressing the energies of her people, are making their exertions unprofitable, and are steadily transferring her natural increase and her natural industries to other regions naturally less favored.

THE ELECTIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRISH
HOME RULE.

THE results of the recent elections in Great Britain and Ireland furnish cause to friends of Ireland and of Ireland's rights, not for chagrin or disappointment, but for congratulation. All the antecedents of the elections, taken together, form a chapter in British Parliamentary history, and a chapter, too, in the long contest, and the progress of the contest towards a happy termination, of Irish aspirations for right, justice, liberty, freedom, against British oppression, injustice and tyranny, which can never be blotted out.

The long, protracted, exhaustive debate in the House of Commons, which resulted in the dissolution of Parliament and the ordering of a new election, demonstrated, beyond all possibility of successful denial or even question, the justice and the necessity of conceding to the people of Ireland the liberty of legislating for the promotion and protection of their own rights and special interests; a necessity, too, which was intertwined as closely with the true interests of Britain as with those of Ireland.

The discussion, both on the floor of the House of Commons and outside in newspapers, and periodicals, and letters, and pamphlets, scattered broadcast through the British Islands, demonstrated also that the motives and arguments against Home Rule for Ireland grew out of a mean and selfish and, in no small degree, malicious combination of landlord greed, aristocratic pride and traditions, Orange bigotry, English stupidity, obstinacy on the part of their squirocracy and their agricultural laborers, personal jealousy of Mr. Gladstone, and personal vain ambition and desires to acquire notoriety, if not fame or power, on the part of a number of sentimental, but unprincipled, professed Radicals and Libéralists. On the other hand, it clearly and irrefutably proved that the demands of the people of Ireland were supported by the whole history of the relation of Britain to Ireland, by natural and divine law, by human consciousness of the eternal principles of right and justice, and by every intelligent comprehension of the real and true interests of the people of Great Britain as well as of Ireland. These facts are now of record and can never be blotted out.

A new election of members to the House of Commons was ordered, and the elections have been held. The results of this election we shall discuss in a subsequent paragraph. During the canvass the opponents of Mr. Gladstone and of his Home Rule proposal spared no means, legitimate or illegitimate, justifiable or base

and contemptible, to mislead and delude the people of Britain. Persuasion, corruption, intimidation, vilification, were unhesitatingly and unscrupulously employed. Old and stale slanders against the people of Ireland were revived. Traditionary prejudices, on the point of expiring, were warmed into new life and activity. Religious prejudices were appealed to, and political and personal falsehoods were disseminated broadcast. Churchill did his utmost to stir up riots and open rebellion in the north of Ireland, hoping that the consequent confusion would bring about a summary withdrawal from Ireland of even the partial rights its people possessed. His efforts, happily, failed, and, if *British law* against treason had been enforced, he would have been consigned to the Tower of London.

In view of all this, it is a wonder that opposition to Home Rule did not sweep over all Britain as fire sweeps through stubble or the dried leaves of a pine forest in summer.

Moreover, there was a combination of other incidents and circumstances against the friends and in favor of the enemies of Irish Home Rule, which the latter did not neglect to effectively employ. The recent Acts, for the extension of the franchise and for the redistribution of seats in Parliament, were, as yet, very imperfectly understood by "the masses" in England who thus had obtained the privilege of voting. They were scarcely conscious of their newly-acquired power, or, if conscious, they knew not how to use it effectively. For "*Hodge*," the traditional epithet applied to the English agricultural drudge, is the slowest to move or change, the stupidest, the most stolid and obstinate creature that breathes and lives, in human form, on the face of the earth. We say "*English*," with deliberate purpose and meaning, excluding the Scotch and Welsh. And, the *English* toilers in mines and mills and factories are little better.

They neglected to register as voters; or, moving into other election districts, they registered, and were deluded into registering in districts where they had no right to vote. Then, too, the elections were held in the harvest season. The owners or holders of the land are Tories, Whigs, or *Plutocrats*, opposed to Irish Home Rule. They shrewdly and systematically drove on their harvest-work, refusing any cessation or interval to the laborers they employed. Thus they compelled them to lose their votes by staying away from the polls.

It was in this way, with all the power of wealth and pride of station and of class, with bold intimidation and reckless falsification, and pandering to the basest passions of fallen humanity, that the defeat of Gladstone was accomplished.

But, before that defeat could be obtained, and a seeming victory

won by the combined Tories, the Whig landlords and the recalcitrant Radicals, declarations and promises had to be made by Hartington and Chamberlain, and their respective followers, of willingness to do justice to Ireland and grant local government; promises which, "like chickens and curses," will "come home to roost" on the heads of those who made them, whether sincerely or with deliberate intention to deceive.

It were useless to fight the battle over again by recounting what reputations were hopelessly wrecked, what aspirants to political influence, power or office went down upon the field, killed or sorely wounded.

Suffice it to say that, throughout the whole conflict, Gladstone towered above all his foes, and proved himself as often before—

" . . . No carpet knight, so trim,
But in close fight a champion grim,
In camp a leader sage."

Never, in any previous conflict, throughout all his long and varied career, did he bear himself so knightly and so nobly. Who were struck down by the sword of his keen logic, who were unhorsed by the spear of his resistless arguments, it is needless to mention. It is enough to know that, of all the members of his Cabinet, of any note, who refused to accept his proposal to grant Home Rule to Ireland, and followed Chamberlain into the "cave" of English Radical dissidents, the only survivor is Chamberlain himself. And he, after going down into the gutter or the cess-pool, to gather dirt with which to bespatter Gladstone and his supporters, must now strive to emerge from it, hoping, but vainly hoping, that he may cleanse himself from the filth with which he has besmirched himself.

To any one who thinks of the attitude of the people of Great Britain only two or three years ago, the results of the election just concluded are scarcely credible; and scarcely credible, too, are the events which, rapidly following each other, compelled that election to be held.

It seems only yesterday that Parnell and his little band of followers were refused a hearing by the House of Commons, were suspended and expelled amidst yells and jeers, were politically and socially ostracised; since most of them were imprisoned in Kilmainham jail; since, of the six hundred and seventy members of the House of Commons, only thirty-five or thirty, or even a less number, of its members could be relied upon to stand resolutely, in face of overwhelming opposition, advocating demands of the Irish people that involved not one-tenth of what Mr. Gladstone's proposals foreshadowed. In this stubborn unreasoning opposition, Tories, Whigs and factionists of every shade and color, both in Britain and from

Ireland (from Ireland, but not of her), were combined without regard to party lines. And one among them was William Ewart Gladstone; and sometimes he was foremost of them.

But on the morrow, as it were, with no other aid than the power of common natural justice, the awakened intelligence of the people of Ireland to their inalienable rights, their contributions from their own scanty savings, and the assistance sent from America and Australia by generous liberty-loving men and women, Parnell, representing the people of Ireland and followed by them, wrung from Whigs and Tories and Orange bigots enough Parliamentary seats to go into the House of Commons with eighty-six members "good and true" pledged to Home Rule.

By him and his faithful followers the Liberals were punished by arraying the Irish vote in Britain against them; and by him and his following the Tories were, in turn, summarily ousted from their short-lived possession of power.

The Liberals, with Mr. Gladstone as their leader, profited by the lesson taught them, and applied themselves to the study of principles of right and justice. The result was the introduction of the Gladstone Home Rule and Land Purchase Bills for Ireland. The House of Commons was unprepared for such proposals. Even prominent followers of Gladstone, and even members of his Cabinet stood aghast. Chamberlain, Goschen, Trevelyan, and others of less note openly rebelled. The Bills were rejected; the one being withdrawn and the other voted down.

It was not strange. It would have been strange indeed if it had not so happened. The House of Commons, the Government and people of Great Britain were asked by Mr. Gladstone, without previous warning or education, to give up the traditionary ideas and prejudices in which for successive generations and hundreds of years they had been brought up and schooled; asked to confess that the whole history of their dealing with Ireland for long centuries was a record of crime and cruelty which they ought to hasten to ask forgiveness and do penance for.

The Gladstone Cabinet resigned, and a dissolution of Parliament and a new election necessarily followed.

And now that the immediate contest is over what is the outcome? We will not enter into details of particular districts won or lost, but simply give the grand result.

Of the six hundred and seventy members that will make up the new House of Commons

317 are Tories,

74 "Unionists" (Whigs or Recalcitrant Liberals),

194 Gladstone Liberals,

85 Followers of Mr. Parnell.

670 in all.

Is there anything in this to discourage the people of Ireland, or their friends and sympathizers in America and other countries? On the contrary, there is every reason to rejoice and redouble effort. Two hundred and seventy-nine members (followers respectively of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell) will enter the House of Commons pledged to Home Rule. Two hundred and seventy-nine in comparison with thirty or thirty-five a year or two ago. Moreover, many of the "Paper Unionists" and some even of the Tories loudly proclaimed that they were not opposed to granting local self-government to the people of Ireland; they were only opposed to Mr. Gladstone's proposed methods and measures. All of them—if their blatant professions were to be believed—loved Ireland and were willing to do her justice. Their love, however, was of different degrees of intensity and proportions. Some loved her very much, and were willing to do anything for her except vote for the Gladstone Bill. Others loved her not quite so much, but were willing to grant her an instalment of justice and a shadow of local county government. But all loved Ireland sincerely; only they did not wish to disintegrate the British Empire. On this string they harped and pleaded and besought the people of Britain to save the Empire from certain destruction by voting for them at the polls. They assured their constituents that they, if elected, would do justice to Ireland by wiser and more effective legislation than Mr. Gladstone had proposed.

The men who made these promises and declarations have defeated Mr. Gladstone; rather, they have seemingly defeated him by acquiring a numerical majority in the House of Commons. But he survives, and, apparently invigorated and made more determined by his overthrow, he will re-enter the House of Commons prepared to battle more resolutely than before for Irish Home Rule.

Then, too, Home Rule has not experienced even a shadow of defeat. The electioneering canvass compelled, as we have just said, numerous candidates opposed to Mr. Gladstone to declare themselves in favor of Home Rule. Their declarations, sincere or insincere, will be remembered. They will have either to make them good, or else to eat their own words, and stand before the public as having obtained seats in the House of Commons by false pretences.

Meanwhile, the English people are being rapidly educated up to an intelligent comprehension of the Home Rule question. The late election contest itself has had a wonderful effect for good in this way. And though the elections are now over, the discussions in newspapers and periodicals over their results and over Irish questions which still occupy a foremost place in public attention, and the debates which are sure to arise over these same questions

in the coming session of Parliament, will continue this educational process.

The rapidity and extent to which public opinion has been brought up to the point of looking upon the granting of Irish Home Rule as a practicable and necessary measure is proved by the smallness of the majority by which the Tories aided by the Liberals defeated Mr. Parnell. It requires only a very slight change in *English* opinion to throw the majority of votes in favor of it instead of against it. We say *English* opinion; for Wales and Scotland have already been won over.

Whether the Tories will undertake to introduce a Home Rule Bill of their own fashioning at the coming session of Parliament, remains to be seen. We regard it as improbable; though they will have to attempt, in some way or other, to legislate on Irish questions. Whatever shape this attempt will take, it will have the effect of demonstrating more clearly and fully the justice and necessity of giving the people of Ireland legislative Home Rule.

There is only one thing that can prevent this, or seriously delay its attainment. It is violence and illegal action on the part of professed friends and supporters of the people of Ireland. If the Irish people and their friends, both in and out of Ireland, are quietly and calmly resolute, and abstain from illegal action, the movement, which has acquired such immense momentum, must and will advance rapidly to a happy consummation.

Meanwhile the importance of Ireland's receiving moral and material assistance from the people of the United States still remains. To the assistance generously furnished up to this time is owing, we believe, in great part, the rapid progress, during the last few years, made by the people of Ireland towards gaining their just rights and liberties. Let this assistance be continued, and ere long Ireland will win Home Rule.

Scientific Chronicle.

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS OF THE SIGNAL SERVICE.

To the courtesy of General W. B. Hazen, Chief Signal Officer U.S.A., we are indebted for the information which enables us to present to our readers a brief summary of the remarkable and progressive work which has been accomplished by the Signal Service Corps.

All are, without doubt, well aware of the fact that the U.S. Signal Service is a special branch of the army that has for its immediate object the "two-fold duty: (1) of providing an efficient corps charged with the work of opening and maintaining communication at the front in time of war; and (2) of noting the development and progress of storms and other meteorological phenomena, and reporting the same to the public with predictions of probable future atmospheric conditions."

It is beyond our present purpose to dwell upon the first of these duties, as our sole desire is to draw attention to the thoroughness of the scientific work accomplished in Meteorology, and to the immense benefit which the nation has derived from the patient labor and timely notifications issued from this Bureau.

As a proof that the Signal Service Corps possesses in the highest degree the entire confidence and esteem of the country, we may produce the following extract from an address of the President of the Geographical Society, Chief Justice Daly: "Nothing in the nature of scientific investigation by the National Government has proved so acceptable to the people, or has been productive in so short a time of such important results, as the establishment of the Signal Service Bureau."

In fact, not only has it answered the purpose had in view by Congress when, in 1870, the Signal Service was charged with the duty of taking meteorological observations in the interest of agriculture, but in reality it has done much more. Besides notifying the public of the daily atmospheric conditions prevailing throughout the entire area of the United States, this bureau sends forth "forecasts" which are of the utmost importance to the commerce and agriculture of the nation. To planters, stockraisers, shippers and merchants, in a word, to nearly every class of business men, these "forecasts" have become almost indispensable auxiliaries in their various commercial transactions. Thousands of dollars' worth of property has been secured against loss, and valuable crops preserved from injury by these timely warnings of approaching storms, frosts, and floods. "Had we, a quarter of a century ago," writes a British meteorologist, "known the rigor of the Crimean climate, who would have dared to send out an army unprepared to meet the hardships of a Black Sea winter? The fact is," continues the same writer,

"there is not a profession, not a handicraft, not a process in animal or vegetable life which is not influenced by meteorological changes."

In order to obtain an idea of the manner in which these valuable results are obtained, let us examine in detail the method employed by the Signal Service Bureau in the preparation of the familiar Weather Charts.

Each day the first labor is devoted to the weather predictions, including storm warnings. These predictions, which are based upon the results of three simultaneous reports telegraphed to Washington from all parts of the United States and Canada, are issued three times every day, under the title of "Indications" and Cautionary Signals.

The number of stations from which telegraphic reports are thrice a day received at the central office is 135.

In addition to these, there are 157 stations from which single daily reports are transmitted; of this class, 12 are situated in the Dominion of Canada. If we include special stations, the total number from which observations were forwarded to Washington on the 30th of June, 1884, was 464.

"These observations include the reading of the barometer and the dry-bulb and wet-bulb thermometer; the direction and velocity of the wind; the amount of rain or snow fallen since last report; the kind and amount, the velocity and direction of movement of the clouds," and other minor observations. From these data are compiled what are termed the "Weather Maps."

On these maps "all the Signal Service Stations are entered in their appropriate geographical places, and annexed to each station are the figures expressing the reading of barometer and thermometer" and the results of the other observations enumerated above.

The relations existing between observations taken at the different stations are made apparent by means of figures and symbols, as well as by lines which are drawn so as to group the geographical areas throughout which like conditions of weather prevail. Armed with this charted material, the officer preparing the predictions, proceeds first to compile the "Synopsis," and then to deduce the "Indications," and issue the necessary storm warnings. The "Synopsis," "Indications" and Cautionary Signals constitute the press report. The average time elapsing between the simultaneous reading of the instruments at the various stations and the issue of the "Synopsis" and "Indications" has been calculated at one hour and forty minutes.

Truly the nation has just cause to feel proud of the efficiency attained by this branch of the public service. A single evidence of the wonderful accuracy of the "Indications" will suffice to show how worthy they are of the confidence reposed in them. For the year ending January 30th, 1883, the percentage of verifications was nearly 90! A brilliant record indeed, and a most gratifying proof of the skill and devotedness of those to whom this trust has been confided.

Regarding the diffusion of these reports, we find that the Bureau endeavors to make them accessible to all. No less than 1095 weather

forecasts are daily telegraphed from the central office to all the principal points in the United States. Cautionary storm signals, which form a very important part of the Signal Service duty, are issued three times a day. "The total number of sea-ports and points on the great lakes and sea-coasts where the storm signals are shown is one hundred and eleven."

We may add a few words on the "International Weather Bureau." Some readers may have been surprised of late at the fact that General Hazen urged before the Congressional committee the necessity of establishing foreign stations with American observers. Large as is the area of our country, it is impossible to study fully the movements of storms without observations covering a much greater portion of our hemisphere, and taken at the same moment of actual time. This object is already in great part accomplished by the international exchange of observations.

The beginning of this work dates no further back than 1870. Previous to the introduction of the system of simultaneous weather reports in the United States by General Meyer, the simultaneous observations taken in any country were comparatively few. "When in September, of the year 1873, an International Meteorological Congress was convened at Vienna—an assemblage composed of the official heads of the meteorological bureaus of the different powers—an original proposition was made by General Meyer, as the Chief Signal Officer of the United States Army, looking towards a world-wide scheme of weather research. General Meyer's proposition was to this effect: 'that it is desirable, with a view to their exchange, that at least one uniform observation, of such a character as to be suited for the preparation of synoptic charts, be taken and recorded daily at as many stations as practicable throughout the world.'"

The Vienna Congress was unanimous in its approval of General Meyer's proposition; and after its adoption by this Congress, and through the courteous coöperation of nearly all the governments of Europe, General Meyer was not long in gathering all the necessary means for putting it into practice. Hence we find that a year had not elapsed from the time the Vienna Congress joined in the resolution, when the exchange of simultaneous reports became sufficiently numerous to admit of making the daily "Weather-Bulletin and Chart"; and on January 1st, 1875, was commenced the regular daily publication, from the Signal Office, of the "Bulletin of International Simultaneous Meteorological Observations, of the Northern Hemisphere." In this bulletin were presented the tabulated results of simultaneous weather reports from all the coöperating observers.

The reports embrace "the combined territorial extent of Algiers, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Central America, China, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Greenland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunis, Turkey, British North America, the United States, the Azores, Malta, Mauritius, the Sandwich Islands,

South Africa, South America, and the West Indies, so far as they have been placed under meteorological surveillance."

In furthering this grand project, the Signal Service has the coöperation of the British, Portuguese, Swedish, and American navies, and hence the daily Bulletin issued from the Signal office gives news also of the great ocean highways, "on which ships of all flags take observations while en route from port to port." The number of those engaged in taking marine observations is 481; and all navigators are requested to contribute to this work whenever opportunity for so doing may present itself. And indeed there are numerous opportunities for the navigator to be of the greatest utility to the service. Did we need illustrations of this, or instances in which even the most unpleasant trials of the seaman's life may be a golden opportunity for doing a vast deal of good, we might cite the example of the steamship "Faraday." The instance is thus briefly narrated: "The steamship 'Faraday,' when laying the last Atlantic cable, encountered a severe cyclone in mid-ocean, which, without heaving to, she reported by her telegraphic wire to Europe, noting the successive changes of wind as the different quadrants of the storm passed over her; thus indicating to those on land the direction and progressive velocity of the gale, so that they could calculate the time and locality at which it would strike upon the European coast." Other instances might be mentioned did the space allowed us permit our so doing. In a word, the international weather service is looked to as the great hope of the meteorology of the future.

RECENT PROGRESS IN THE METALLURGY OF ALUMINIUM.

At length the time seems to have arrived when Aluminium can assume its proper rank in the industrial arts, and displace iron and other common metals in many of the uses to which they are now applied. Next to oxygen and silicon, Aluminium is the most common element in nature. Constituting the base of most rocks and soils, of clay, marl and other minerals, this metal is even more abundant than iron, and forms no less than a twelfth part of the solid crust of our globe. While occurring so commonly, Aluminium has exceptionally valuable properties. It remains untarnished in the air even when heated or exposed to sulphurous vapors; it is not attacked by vegetable acids; it is highly sonorous, malleable and ductile, and may be cast in sand or iron moulds; it conducts electricity as well as silver; and while extremely light, forms with other metals alloys remarkable for their great tensile strength, their beautiful color, and other properties.

Hitherto this metal has been but sparingly employed for practical purposes, as its metallurgy was difficult and expensive. In fact, the pure metal was scarce from the time of its discovery by Wöhler until the year 1854, when Professor Henry St. Claire Deville devised an im-

proved method for its extraction ; since then it has been produced on a larger scale, but its price was never less than \$10.00 per pound. Within the last few months, however, two new methods have been discovered which, it is claimed, will reduce its price to somewhat less than \$2.00 per pound. Though at first this price seems still rather high, it is relatively only a little greater than that of tin at fifty cents per pound, since for equal weights the bulk of this metal is only about one-third that of Aluminium.

In our issue of January last we gave the outlines of one of these methods, viz.: the method of Messrs. Cowles, of Cleveland. Since then their process has been much improved, as may be gleaned from the communication of Professor T. Sterry Hunt, of Montreal, to the National Academy of Science, in the April meeting at Washington. By increasing their plant, the Cowles Bros. have reduced the cost of Aluminium bronze to thirty cents per pound. They have also succeeded in making alloys with iron, silver, and other metals, and have obtained from these alloys pure Aluminium by sublimation and reduction.

At present we wish to note merely the second method, which has been devised by an eminent chemist of New York City, Mr. H. Y. Castner.

This method is substantially the same as that of Deville. As is well known, the Deville process involves three distinct stages: in the first, Alumina or Aluminium oxide is obtained from clay or corundum; in the second, from this oxide the chloride is prepared; in the third, the chloride is reduced by metallic sodium. The expense of the third stage, owing to the high price of sodium, reaches about 75 per cent. of the cost of the whole process.

Mr. Castner has succeeded in lowering the cost of this third stage by reducing the price of sodium from \$5.00 to twenty-five cents per pound. The other stages of the process, however, remain unchanged, though these will now be worked at a smaller expense, as Aluminium will be produced on a more extended scale.

As yet the patents of this invention have not been issued for foreign countries, hence Mr. Castner is unwilling to publish the precise nature of the new process for preparing cheap sodium. From what is known at present, it appears that the chemical reactions, by which this preparation is effected, are quite different from those of the old method proposed by Brunner in 1808. The general working of the process still remains the same with the exception of the following improvements: The temperature at which the metal is distilled being much lower than before, most of the danger accompanying the old process is avoided, and at the same time the large iron crucibles in which the distillation takes place last longer. Besides, the full yield of metal is obtained from each charge, and the operation is rendered easier by an ingenious contrivance which allows the crucible to be automatically raised through apertures in the bottom of the furnace. We may add that Mr. Castner's method of preparing sodium, apart from its utility in the production of cheaper Aluminium, is very valuable in itself. Pure sodium enters

largely into the industries, and is employed in the preparation of pure magnesium, boron, and silicon. The use of these elements, or of their compounds as silicon and boron bronzes, at present very limited on account of their high price, may thus be rendered more general.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE SOLAR SPECTRUM.

Professor H. A. Rowland, of the Johns Hopkins University, has lately published a very exact photographic map of the Fraunhofer lines. This work must prove of high value in the study of the Solar Spectrum, it reflects great credit upon the author, and shows once more how our country is taking the lead in all branches of science.

It is well-known that the Solar Spectrum, when obtained pure, is not continuous, but is interrupted by many dark lines perpendicular to its length. These lines are called Fraunhofer's lines, after the scientist who first attempted to map them. Such a spectrum—an absorption spectrum, as it is technically termed—gives us, after the discoveries made by Bunsen and Kirchhoff, an insight into the physical constitution of the sun. Thus, by means of the spectroscope, we have discovered in one of the solar envelopes, called the reversing layer, no less than fifteen metals known on our globe, besides hydrogen, and two other substances which as yet have not been found on the surface of the earth. The explanation of these dark lines in the solar spectrum is due to Kirchhoff. He was the first to state that gases and vapors have the power of absorbing those very rays which they themselves give out when in a state of incandescence. As an example, let us take the spectrum of sodium. The spectrum of this metal consists of a bright-yellow double line. If the light produced by incandescent lime be allowed to shine through the sodium vapor, the yellow line becomes black. From this fact we may draw important conclusions. Since the solar spectrum has dark lines where sodium, iron, etc., give bright ones, it is probable that around the body of the sun, which throws out the light, there exists a vaporous envelope which, like the sodium flame in the experiment described above, absorbs certain rays, namely, those which the envelope itself emits, and we are at the same time led to the conclusion that in this vapor there exist the metals sodium, iron, etc. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance to gain a better knowledge of the lines of the solar spectrum.

Many eminent scientists mapped these lines after Fraunhofer, but whenever refraction spectra are used the mapping is arbitrary, for in this case the position of the lines depends on the substance of the prisms. Amströng was the first to give a normal position according to the wavelength. Professor Rowland has perfected this method by means of diffraction spectra. As is well-known, physicists give the name of diffraction to that modification which light undergoes when it passes the sharp edge of a body, or when it traverses small apertures—a modification

such that the luminous rays become bent, and penetrate into the geometrical shadow, and at the same time interfere very near the shadow. When the rays are of ordinary white light, their interference produces beautiful spectra, much purer, though fainter, than those obtained by prisms, and the colors are divided exactly according to their wave-length. This phenomenon is best seen with gratings, which may be made by carefully ruling on glass or on speculum metal very fine lines parallel to each other. The best diffraction gratings ever made are those ruled by Professor Rowland, and contain 14,700 lines to the inch. The number of lines might be increased, but experiment has shown that the above number gives the best results.

Professor Rowland's photographic maps of the solar spectrum have been made with one of his concave gratings of $21\frac{1}{2}$ feet radius of curvature and 6 inches diameter. These maps are more exact and give greater detail than any other map now in existence, for the best gratings up to this time consisted only of about 6000 lines to the inch. The error in the wave-length at no part exceeds $\frac{1}{50000}$ of the whole.

We cannot dismiss this subject without referring briefly to the photographic study of Stellar Spectra. This study was undertaken by the late Professor Henry Draper: his plans included an extensive investigation, one object of which was to catalogue and classify the stars by their spectra. Mrs. Draper has made provision, at the observatory at Harvard College, for continuing these researches. The part of the sky to be surveyed is that extending from the north pole to the parallel of thirty degrees south declination. Each photograph will be exposed for about one hour, and will include a region ten degrees square. Experiments are now in progress with the fifteen-inch equatorial, with the object of representing the spectra of some typical stars upon a large scale. The spectra so far obtained are about six centimeters in length, and exhibit well defined detail. The present results encourage the expectation that the movement of stars in the line of sight may be better determined by the photographic method than by direct observations.

PASTEUR AND HYDROPHOBIA.

THE brilliant scientific investigations of M. Pasteur afford a striking example of the extremes that can be expected from public opinion. We have, on the one hand, scientists, wealthy men, and even the government, offering large sums to promote the international "Pasteur Institute" in Paris, while in other large cities, as in New York, similar ones are being planned. The remotest parts of Europe, as well as our own country, help to swell the crowd of patients at the Pasteur Laboratory, in the *rue d'Ulm*, and we cannot but notice the enthusiasm that his researches have everywhere aroused in the scientific world. On the other hand—not to speak of those who cast doubt on his success—the most violent attacks have been made on the great savant, and some

writers have gone so far as to accuse him of fraudulent pretensions. We must say, however, that many of these attacks, owing to the quarters from which they emanate, appear even at first sight suspicious. Most of Pasteur's enemies are enemies of mankind. They blame him because he does not join them in their anti-Christian theories.

With these facts before us, it is with pleasure we receive the announcement that the English and German Governments have appointed commissions of well-known scientific men whose names are a guarantee against all suspicion, such as Sir S. Paget, Sir H. Roscoe, Professor Koch and others, to examine into Pasteur's method, and that there are at present in Paris, for the same end, not a few doctors representing almost every nationality, prominent among whom are the delegates from the Roman Academy of Medicine.

The verification, however, of Pasteur's claims is not an easy task, for it is less than a year since his method was first applied and it is very difficult to ascertain the cases of real hydrophobia. M. Pasteur, in a communication to the French Academy of Science about the 12th of April, stated that among those treated by him only one had died out of 688 patients injured by dogs, and three out of 38 bitten by wolves, a fact showing, as he remarked, that wolves' virus, though of the same kind, is much more virulent than that of dogs. Certainly these few failures soon after the introduction of the method do not prove anything against it, especially as those who died were treated only some weeks after the accident had taken place. But, notwithstanding M. Pasteur's care in inquiring into the circumstances of the bites, who can assure us that all those persons, without his care, would have died? All vicious dogs are not "mad" and all "mad dogs" are not rabid. Besides, it often happens that the bites are not fatal, either because the wound is not deep enough, or because accidental causes prevent the virus from entering the organism. Such circumstances explain why among the many who were bitten by animals supposed to be rabid, the last census of our country records only 80 deaths from hydrophobia. That many such cases, however, are real, cannot be doubted and the evil seems to be spreading. It is true that in some places, as in Russia, owing to the enforcement of stringent laws, the statistics show a falling off, but in France, according to the official data of the *Ministère de l'Intérieur* in 1885, there were 568 real cases of hydrophobia against 301 of the previous year.

The following will give some idea of the method which M. Pasteur adopted after a long series of experiments:

The cure lasts for ten consecutive days. Each patient daily receives an inoculation or injection of the carefully prepared virus at a point on the waist, the operation producing no suffering, being much the same as vaccination. The quantity of the injected liquid is always the same, but its strength is increased on successive days, so that the liquid used on the last day, if it were injected into a healthy rabbit, would cause death from hydrophobia in eight or ten days. The successive inoculations seem to render the patient incapable of being affected by the next one, and all together, especially the last, free him entirely, in M. Pasteur's

opinion, from any danger of hydrophobia, whether the germ has been received into the body or not. Ordinarily, the patients do not experience anything from the effects of the injection, not even what is generally felt after vaccination. The difficult operation, and one to which M. Pasteur brings the utmost care, mainly belongs to the preparation of the virus, which is obtained from rabbits. This process, in its principal features, may thus be explained according to the *compte-rendu* of the French Academy. A rabbit is inoculated by trepanning the skull and placing beneath the *dura mater* a bit of the spinal cord from a rabid animal. Hydrophobia is always developed after a period of incubation of about fifteen days. If from the spinal cord of the first rabbit a second be inoculated in the same way, and from the second a third, and so on in a regular series, it is found that the period of incubation becomes shorter and shorter, till, after the virus has thus passed through forty or fifty rabbits, the duration of the incubation is reduced to seven days. Now, if portions of the spinal cords of rabbits that have died of the intense virus thus obtained be cut out with every precaution to prevent contamination, and kept in an artificially dry atmosphere, the virulence of the poison progressively disappears.

These fragments, preserved for a longer or shorter time, are used by M. Pasteur in preparing liquids of different strength. They are rubbed in "sterilized bouillon," namely, broth in which all animal germs have been previously destroyed by raising it to a high temperature. The solutions obtained in this way are used on different days; that taken on the last day is the strongest, being prepared from the cord of a rabbit which has died a few hours before.

At the last moment we learn that at the Johns Hopkins University Dr. Sternberg has begun to prepare some virus according to the method above described. The first two rabbits were inoculated with the virus taken from a gentleman who died in Brooklyn last May, from hydrophobia. The period of incubation was about 18 days, showing that the virus was very weak. We may, therefore, expect that before long some protective virus may be ready for use in this country.

Book Notices.

OUTLINES OF UNIVERSAL HISTORY. Designed as a Text-Book and for Private Reading. By *George Parke Fisher, D.D., LL.D.*, Professor in Yale College. Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Company, Publishers. New York and Chicago.

Professor Fisher's purpose in writing this book, as we learn from his preface, was to present the essential facts of history in due order and in conformity with the latest and most thorough researches, and to point out the connection of events and successive eras with one another, in order that thus the unity of history may be illustrated. The author declares his conviction that "the most interesting object in the study of history is that which most nearly touches the inner life of man, namely, the vicissitudes of institutions, social, political and religious." He adds, quite correctly, in the words of Dr. Arnold, that "a knowledge of the external is needed before we can arrive at a knowledge of that within. . . . And thus we want to know clearly the geographical boundaries of different countries, and their external revolutions. This leads us in the first instance to geography and history, even if our ultimate object lies beyond."

In accordance with these ideas, Professor Fisher has paid great attention in his work to the political geography of the world at different periods, and also to the physical features of its different countries. Upwards of thirty maps, in the preparation of which, evidently, no pains has been spared to secure perfect accuracy and distinctness, aid the reader in comprehending the changes wrought from time to time by military and political movements on different continents and countries.

In the composition of this volume Professor Fisher has had the advantage of great natural ability and acquired knowledge and prolonged study of various subjects, some of them immediately connected with history, others more remotely, yet still related to it. He has not only brought these advantages to the preparation of his work, but has evidently spared no additional labor, effort and research to make it as perfect from his own point of view as possible. The arrangement as regards the progress of events is admirable, the classification and the subdivision of subjects is clear and well carried out. It is a model of lucid, yet concise, statement of facts and events.

Yet just here Professor Fisher seems to have erred and contradicted his own theory of history on an all-important point. He has endeavored, and of course unsuccessfully endeavored, to unite comprehensiveness of view and multiplicity of topics with extreme condensation. He believes in the unity of history, and also that the *Divine Will* is a factor in history—a factor not destructive of, nor incompatible with, the freedom of the human will, but which is wholly permissive of it and consistent with it. Yet he endeavors to compress what, as regards its form and contents, is not a compendium of historical events, but a universal history of the human race, including its movements as respects war, politics, literature, art, industry, morals and religion, into the compass of a single 12mo. volume of 674 pages, including a copious index. The result is, of course, a failure as regards the interior significance of movements and events. Their true, real, moral and religious bearings and influences (and this after all constitutes their actual importance) are necessarily cursorily treated.

In this as in other respects Professor Fisher is inconsistent with, and has unconsciously contradicted, his own theory of history. He believes that the All Wise and Omnipotent Will of God as well as the free will of man is a constant factor in human history. Yet, as he declares, he has endeavored to write the outlines of a universal history of the human race from an "unsectarian" point of view; and this means—it can mean nothing else from a non-Catholic's pen—from a point of view which ignores *religion*, and consequently the Divine Will, as the ruler and guider of all human events to their ultimate results and consequences.

MISTAKES OF MODERN INFIDELS; OR EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. COMPRISING A COMPLETE REFUTATION OF COLONEL INGERSOLL'S SO-CALLED MISTAKES OF MOSES, AND OF OBJECTIONS OF VOLTAIRE, PAINE AND OTHERS AGAINST CHRISTIANITY. By *Rev. George R. Northgraves*, Diocese of London, Ontario, Canada. Second Edition—Revised and Corrected. Detroit: Free Press Printing House, 1886.

This work is dedicated to the Right Rev. John Walsh, Bishop of London, Ontario, Canada. And in answer to the letter informing him of the author's intention to dedicate it to him, the Right Rev. Bishop, in anticipation of the publication of the work, declared his warm approval of the purpose and object of the book, and also testified in emphatic terms to the distinguished ability and ripe scholarship of the author, expressing his conviction that the book would be "a thorough and triumphant refutation of the misleading sophisms and specious . . . objections of the infidel school against the truth of the Christian religion."

Any one who has studied the evidences of Christianity and has been compelled to read or pay any attention to the objections of infidels, for the purpose of refuting them, needs only to glance down the pages of this volume to be convinced that the belief and hope expressed by Bishop Walsh with regard to its value and usefulness were well founded.

It is not an easy task, indeed it is a supremely difficult one, to write a book for general popular reading in answer to the objections and false assertions of modern infidels. The difficulty consists not in any originality or special subtlety or force in their objections and falsifications, nor yet in difficulty in stating facts and framing arguments that completely refute them. It consists in and grows out of an unfortunate characteristic of the age in which we live. Modern education and the habits and tendencies of our age have made the general public quick of apprehension, but superficial and illogical in its intellectual processes. It is satisfied with first impressions and thoughts, without taking the necessary time or possessing the necessary patience, and, in too many instances, is destitute of the necessary ability (owing to one-sided and imperfect training) to ascertain whether its first impressions are true or false. It rests on these impressions, and is unwilling to take the trouble to listen to or read thoughtful and thorough refutations of their erroneousness.

Hence the writer who sits down to answer infidel objections and refute infidel sophisms, has a hard task before him, if he intends that his book shall be read by the general public. For, to refute a sneer or a sarcasm, however contrary to fact, to truth and justice it may be, if not impossible, yet is the most difficult task a writer can undertake; and to drag into the light and thoroughly answer a false assertion, a lie that may be stated in ten lines, may require as many chapters.

Yet this difficult task the reverend author of the work before us has undertaken and performed. How admirably well he has done his work the warm approvals and commendations of it by nine distinguished Catholic Archbishops and Bishops that we know of, after having read his book,

and of a number of prominent Episcopalian Bishops and Clergymen and other prominent Presbyterian and Methodist Clergymen, strongly testify. The newspaper and periodical press also have noticed it in terms of high praise.

And the work deserves it. Brevity, conciseness and directness of statement and argument characterize it from beginning to end. Yet it is transparent in its lucidity of thought and language. It is a fit companion to Father Lambert's volume—"Notes on Ingersoll." Indeed, it is a valuable supplement to it. It answers and refutes, in a way that any intelligent person can apprehend, all the current objections that Infidels and Free-thinkers urge against the existence of God and his Attributes, against the existence, spirituality and immortality of the human soul, against the necessity, fact, credibility, and truth of Divine Revelation, the genuineness and authenticity, consistency and truth of Sacred Scriptures; especially of the Pentateuch and its statements respecting the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, and other facts therein recorded; as well as other numerous quibbles, misrepresentations and sophisms of modern infidels.

LIBRARY OF ST. FRANCIS DE SALES. WORKS OF THIS DOCTOR OF THE CHURCH, TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH. By the *Rev. Henry Benedict Mackey, O. S. B.*, under the Direction of the Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O. S. B., Bishop of Newport and Menevia. Vol. iii. *The Catholic Controversy*, now First Edited from the Autograph MSS. at Rome and at Annecy. With a hitherto unpublished section on the Authority of the Pope. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates, 1886.

This treatise is the message of St. Francis de Sales to the Calvinists. It was reluctantly written, because they would not, or could not without incurring the punishment of penal anti-Catholic laws, go to hear him preach. He neither published it nor named it. The Rev. translator has called it "*The Catholic Controversy*," partly because it corresponds with the title given it by the French editor, but chiefly because its scope is to state and justify the Catholic doctrine against Calvin and his fellow-heretics.

It is the Catholic position ever against them and all other heretics, and a defence of Catholicity as such. At the same time it is incidentally the defence of Christianity, because St. Francis de Sales' justification of Catholicity consists precisely in this, that it alone is Christianity; and his argument turns entirely on the fundamental question of the exclusive authority of the Catholic Church as the sole representative of Christianity and Christ.

In Part I. he shows at length that the Catholic Church alone has a mission; that she alone is sent to teach; and that thus the authority of all other teachers (outside of her communion and not subject to her) is void, and their teaching but the vain teaching of men.

He tests this teaching in Part II., by the Rule of Faith. He assumes as common ground that the Word of God is the Rule of Faith. He then shows that Reformers (so-called) have composed a false scripture, and that they have also erred in rejecting Sacred Tradition or the *unwritten* Word of God. He then shows that, while the Word of God is the Formal Rule of Faith, there is need of a *judge* who may explain, apply and authoritatively declare the meaning of the Word; and that judge is the Holy Catholic Church.

In Part III. he takes up the doctrines of the Church in detail. But of this Part there only remain three chapters, on the Sacraments and on Purgatory.

Of the intrinsic merits of the work we need scarcely speak. For the Saint's name and holy fame are sufficient guarantee of its clearness, forcibleness, directness, and simplicity of statement and argumentation, and of its value and usefulness in refuting heretical notions, which have descended to our own age, as well as of the edifying influence of this treatise in common with all that this distinguished Saint spoke or wrote, upon true and faithful children of the Church.

THE LIFE OF THE VENERABLE JOSEPH MARCHAND, APOSTOLIC MISSIONARY AND MARTYR. By *Abbé F. B. S. Jacquenet*, Director of the Besançon Séminary. Translated from the French, with a Preface by Lady Herbert. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1886.

It is through tears and blood that the holy missionaries of the Church preach the true faith to-day and rear the Cross as it was in the days of old. The declaration that "the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church," is as true now as it was in the times of the emperors of pagan Rome. The Lives, therefore, of holy missionaries who suffer persecution and torture and death for Christ's sake, are even more edifying than those of martyrs of long past ages.

The little work before us contains an account of one of these martyrs of our own century. And for this reason it is all the more valuable and will be all the more interesting and edifying to those who read it in a proper spirit and with proper intentions. For if the knowledge of what those who lived in times long past and endured all manner of tribulations for Christ's sake is useful to encourage us and strengthen us in resolutely continuing to fight the good fight of the Faith to the end, surely an acquaintance with what "Confessors" of the Faith and Martyrs are now enduring will be still more edifying. It will serve, too, to dispel a dangerous illusion. The idea is entertained by some that the age of persecution of Christianity, of the true Church and of its faithful children, is past. Yet neither in the un-Christian nations, whose wicked and impious customs skeptics and haters of Christianity frame apologies for, nor among "civilized" peoples, have hatred and persecution of the true Church of Christ and its followers and missionaries ceased.

Blessed Father Joseph Marchand was born at the commencement of the present century. After his ordination he was sent as a missionary to China. How faithfully and heroically, and with what self-denials and sufferings, he labored there, the little volume before us narrates. He received the glorious crown of martyrdom in 1835, after enduring tortures equal to, if not surpassing, any that were inflicted upon Christians in the days of Nero and Domitian.

And, though it may be aside from the immediate subject of our notice to refer to it, the same horrible tortures are inflicted upon Catholic missionaries in China, and the same persecution of the true Faith is carried on by the Chinese at this moment when we are writing, as existed a few years ago, and in previous centuries.

FLORA, THE ROMAN MARTYR. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company.

This work, in two good-sized 12mo. volumes, may never take a place among the classics of the language, but in this respect it may find itself in very good company. Written many years ago, by an English visitor to Rome, who dedicates it to the memory of the late Cardinal Antonelli, some may wonder why it is brought before the public only now. The author, who modestly disavows any literary pretensions, gives it to the world, we are told in the preface, "with a view of recording in their

first freshness the impressions of devotion gathered at many a Roman shrine." After a cursory perusal, we are easily led to believe that more than "several pages of it were hastily penned amidst the bustle of sight-seeing, when the connecting thread of the plot often became tangled, sometimes broken." We therefore readily grant the indulgence "asked for on account of certain anachronisms," as well as other things, and pardon the slight liberties taken with dates. The reader also may enjoy the lengthy descriptions, regarding them, like the author, with "the enthusiasm called up by the classical reminiscences of the Italian land," which "caused the writer to dwell too long on some favorite scene."

The story, which on the whole is edifying and healthy reading, belongs to the later age of Christian suffering under the pagan Roman Empire, opening in the summer of the year 235 of the Christian era. Most of the characters are fictitious, but some historical personages, like St. Lawrence and Origen, though perhaps not with exact reference to the incidents in their careers referred to, are introduced. A fanciful connection, too, is made with the infant Church in Britain. There are better and more artistically constructed books of the kind than "*Flora*," but there are few more harmless and more edifying to the young reader.

THE CHRISTIAN STATE OF LIFE, OR SERMONS ON THE PRINCIPAL DUTIES OF CHRISTIANS IN GENERAL, AND OF DIFFERENT STATES IN PARTICULAR. In seventy-six sermons. Adapted to all the Sundays and Holy Days in the Year. By the *Rev. Francis Hunolt*, Priest of the Society of Jesus and Preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne, 1740, by the Rev. J. Allen, D.D. In two volumes. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis. 1886.

Father Hunolt's sermons have been long and very favorably known in Europe. They are sound in doctrine, direct and practical in method. They display a thorough and accurate acquaintance with human nature, and powerfully appeal to every motive that can lead to virtue or to contrition and reformation of life. The style is plain, simple, concise. They are well adapted to aid clergymen, whose time is so engrossed by other duties that they cannot find leisure to write sermons. They also will furnish the laity with highly useful and edifying reading matter.

COMPENDIUM GRADUALIS ET MISSALIS ROMANI concinnatum ex editionibus typicis cura et auctoritate S. R. Cong. publicatis. Published by Fr. Pustet, New York and Cincinnati. 1886.

This latest publication by Chev. Pustet, though quite unpretentious when compared with his greater Liturgical works, is far from being the least important of the series; and it will soon, no doubt, be the most widely disseminated. We expect to see it in the hands of every student in our Colleges and Seminaries; and we strongly recommend it to the Rev. Clergy as a succinct, comprehensive and authoritative storehouse of information regarding the Morning Services of the Church. It contains all that is of practical interest to us scattered through the *Graduale*, the *Missale*, and the *Directorium Cleri*. A college or seminary whose students are furnished with this Compendium and the stereotyped editions of the *Vesperale* and *Holy Week Service*, is quite adequately equipped for the celebration of the Divine Offices in "holy becomingness." We respectfully direct the attention of the Rev. Clergy to the brief but pregnant extracts from the *Directorium Cleri* which the editor very wisely prefixes to his work. We venture to state that one hour's perusal of this little book would go far to eliminate a great many defects observable in the singing of Mass, defects altogether owing to complete inadvertence or a false impression that an extraordinary effort is required to supply the place of an early systematic training in Gregorian chant.

A HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN SYMBOLS AND STORIES OF THE SAINTS, AS ILLUSTRATED IN ART. By *Clara Erskine Clement*. Edited by Katherine E. Conway. With Descriptive Illustrations. Boston: Ticknor and Company. 1886.

Elegance of binding and other mechanical features of a book must not be taken as an indication of the intrinsic value of the contents. So often is it otherwise, indeed, that suspicion is now awakened in most minds against the reading matter put between attractive looking covers, publishers having long made it a habit to deck out inferior literary ware in tinsel show so as to catch the eye of the frivolous lover of display. It is, then, with genuine pleasure that we welcome and recommend a work belonging to the class of exceptions to this rule, and certainly a very striking exception is the book whose title we give above. Paper, press-work, illustrations, binding, are all of a very superior order, but none too good for the character of the reading, of which, though printed from bold, clear type, there is an unusually large amount to the page.

The object the author has in view is to make the reader familiar with "symbolic forms which are known in a general way to represent the mysteries and facts of the Christian faith, but which fail to recall them to the uninitiated beholder in anything like a distinct and accurate manner." Her plan is admirably carried out in this collection of sacred legends and stories illustrated in art, which she prefaces with an essay on Symbolism, as pertaining to her subject. We are pleased also to observe that the book is furnished with a complete alphabetical Index. It is dedicated, by permission, to Archbishop Williams, of Boston.

THE ROMAN VESPERAL, ACCORDING TO THE VESPERALE ROMANUM, FOR THE ENTIRE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. For the Use of Catholic Choirs and School-children. By the *Rev. John B. L. Jung*, Priest of the Diocese of Cleveland. With the Approbation of the Right Rev. R. Gilmour, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This work contains the Vesper Services of the Church for the whole ecclesiastical year. The reverend author says, in his preface, that it is intended "to meet the wants of school-children and others who wish to join in the congregational singing of Vespers." The antiphons are omitted, being left to the select choir.

THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. With Notes by *John Oldcastle*. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. London: Burns & Oats.

This is a delightful book, made up chiefly from letters of Cardinal Manning and brief notes and statements by the author. It presents a clearer and more distinct view of the personal character of its illustrious subject than more elaborate accounts could give. Its value is enhanced, too, by five portraits taken at different periods of Manning's life, the date of the first one being 1812, and of the last 1886.

MURPHY SERIES OF ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC READERS. Published with the Approbation of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

This series commences with a Primer and Infant Reader, and then continues through six successive volumes. Good judgment has been exercised in selecting the reading matter. It is varied in subject and style, and is well adapted in each volume to the mental capacity of the scholars for whose use it is intended. The typographical execution is admirably well done. Solid white paper, clear type, firm and durable binding, and numerous illustrations, far superior to those found in most publications of this character.

